LIBRARY
STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE
JOHNSON CITY, TENNESSEE

The Nation

FOUNDED 1865

Vol. CXLII NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 29, 1936 No. 3682

Contents

EDITORIAL PARAGRAPHS 113
EDITORIALS:
The Uses of Woodrow Wilson 116
The League Falters 117
Remove the Rat 117
Infancy of an Art 118
ISSUES AND MEN. A MEASURE OF AMERICA'S BETRAYAL. By Oswald Garrison Villard 119
CARTOON. By Fritz 120
THE RIDDLE OF THE SUPREME COURT. I. THE DIVINE RIGHT OF JUDGES. By Max Lerner 121
ARMS OVER EUROPE. V. MUSSOLINI OUTBLUFFS ENGLAND. By Louis Fischer 123
THE LAST WAR AND THE NEXT. II. WHAT DOES NEUTRALITY MEAN? By Walter Millis 125
WASHINGTON WEEKLY. By Paul W. Ward 128
LOOSE CONSTRUCTION. By Heywood Broun 129
CORRESPONDENCE 130
LABOR AND INDUSTRY:
How to Break a Labor Union. By Ray L. Kringer 131
Facts for Consumers. By Ruth Brindze 132
BOOKS, DRAMA, FILMS:
Revisitation. By Siegfried Sassoon 134
A New Poet. By Philip Blair Rice 134
Order Versus Chaos. By Maxwell S. Stewart 134
Gustav Stresemann. By Ludwig Lore 135
The Romantic Personality. By Frederick Dupee 136
Shorter Notices 136
Drama: The Trappings of Romance. By Joseph Wood Krutch . 138
Films. René Clair Goes West. By Mark Van Doren 138
CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE 140

BOARD OF EDITORS
FREDA KIRCHWEY JOSEPH WOOD KRUTCH
MAX LERNER

ASSOCIATE EDITORS
MARGARET MARSHALL MAXWELL S. STEWART
DOROTHY VAN DOREN

OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD
CONTRIBUTING EDITOR

SUBSCRIPTION RATES—DOMESTIC: One Year $5; Two Years $8; Three years $11. CANADIAN: 50 cents a year additional. FOREIGN: $1 a year additional.

THREE WEEKS' NOTICE AND THE OLD ADDRESS AS WELL AS THE NEW ARE REQUIRED FOR CHANGE OF SUBSCRIBER'S ADDRESS.

THE NATION. Published weekly at 20 Vesey St., New York. Entered as second class matter December 13, 1897, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., and under the Act of March 3, 1879. Copyright, 1935, by the Nation, Inc.

Muriel C. Gray, Advertising Manager. Walter F. Grueninger, Circulation Manager. Cable Address: Nation, New York.

ONE OF THE FEW remaining monarchs of a first-rate power, King George V bore with dignity and seemliness the burden of providing the world with the pomp and circumstance of kingship. Whether the plain people in America and all over the world really mourned him is difficult to say. We feel certain that the King's death scarcely warranted the eight pages which the New York *Times* devoted to it on Tuesday morning, or the eleven pages with which the *Herald Tribune* outdid its contemporary. To a political observer the striking thing about the King's passing was the smoothness with which the succession of power took place. The expense of the royal establishment is probably warranted by the function which the kingship so beautifully serves—that of stabilizing the political system, much as the American Constitution does. But the British kingship does its job with far less rigid consequences for the whole social structure. During George's reign the British Empire became the British Commonwealth of Nations—a vaster change than any contemplated at present by the adherents of a constitutional amendment in America, and carried through with less intensity of feeling than we are likely to have. The King himself, although unassuming personally, was by no means inactive in affairs of state. There is considerable evidence that he intervened unconstitutionally in the establishment of a Cabinet of national concentration to save the financial structure of England from a possibly radical Labor government. Economically England, despite its derelict areas that are like scars on the face of the country, has survived the depression better than most countries and has better social legislation than America. For England, at least, monarchy seems to be more than an archaic survival. It has visible effects in social cohesion.

BY THE TIME these lines are read the Senate's "baby-bond" bonus bill will presumably have been accepted by the House and forwarded to the President. That it can be passed over Mr. Roosevelt's veto is a foregone conclusion, judging by the tremendous majority which it obtained in both branches of Congress. We are not so much concerned that this may be the entering wedge for a new period of unrestricted government spending as that it may be taken as a pretext for refusing money for socially desirable purposes. Despite all the current talk of governmental extravagance, it is evident that the amount of money that Congress can appropriate is strictly limited. If the bonus bill is enacted, there is certain to be increased pressure for the curtailment of needed expenditures for relief, housing, and social security. An illustration of this pressure may be seen in the unscrupulous exploitation of Secretary Morgenthau's statement that new Treasury financing would total $11,500,000,000 in the next year and a half. Actually more than half of this amount, or $5,800,000,000, is accounted for by routine refinancing to meet maturities of short-term notes, which with $2,000,000,000 for the bonus leaves a deficit of $3,700,000,000 attributable to the Administration's recovery program. The zest with which the Republicans have supported the bonus is sufficient evidence regarding the sincerity of their constant prattle about economy. Their satisfaction has doubtless been enhanced by the knowledge that they were not only getting votes for themselves but effectively sabotaging the Administration's social program.

DEVELOPMENTS on the farmers' front are none too encouraging. Mr. Roosevelt has resurrected the Soil Conservation Act of 1935 and turned it into a substitute for the invalidated AAA. Mr. Hoover has delivered himself of a farm plan of his own to serve as a plank in the Republican platform. The Soil Conservation Act was designed to preserve fertility by the withdrawal from cultivation of land which threatens to become exhausted by over-use. Farmers whose land has thus been withdrawn are to be reimbursed by the government. When pressed by reporters to distinguish between limitation of land use for purposes of soil conservation and limitation for purposes of crop control, Mr. Roosevelt refused to comment. On the other side is Mr. Hoover, who introduced his plan with a denunciation of the AAA in these words: "The farmer has less to sell and pays more

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for what he buys. Labor pays for it in increased cost of living. By this device we get the economic dog running around in circles chasing its own tail." But Mr. Hoover is still running around in circles, too. He agrees with the Supreme Court that national efforts to relieve the farm situation are a "flagrant flouting of the Constitution," but he produces a farm program of his own which is at heart much less different from the Democratic program than he pretends. He carries over from the AAA federal intervention in agriculture, retirement of submarginal lands, and subsidies financed by some such levy as a manufacturers' sale tax instead of the processing tax. Whether Mr. Hoover's proposal is any less unconstitutional than Mr. Roosevelt's is a matter for the G. O. P. and the Democrats to fight over among themselves; meanwhile, the farmer, whose votes both are trying to win, stands to gain very little.

THE AMENDMENT to the Administration's neutrality bill reaffirming America's traditional insistence on the freedom of the seas seriously undermines the value of that measure as a means of avoiding international friction. Throughout its history, insistence on this right has been a constant source of trouble for the United States. The experience of the World War showed that there can be no real freedom for neutral shippers in any war in which the British Empire with its naval power is involved. Even more serious difficulties would be created if the League should attempt to enforce an embargo against an aggressor and the United States should insist on maintaining "normal exports" to the offender. In fact, the application of normal trade quotas to belligerents, as provided by the bill, would clearly work to the advantage of such countries as Germany or Italy if they launched a war of aggression. With the possibility of averting a general world conflict dependent very largely on the outcome of the present efforts to strengthen the League, the least that the United States can do is to avoid legislation which will obstruct the development of a system of international sanctions.

JAPAN'S WITHDRAWAL from the London Naval Conference, though provoked by the military-fascist clique, may lead to a distinct setback in Tokyo's imperialistic ambitions. With finances already strained to the breaking-point by war preparations, Japan will find a general race in naval armaments—such as now seems inevitable—far more burdensome than will either of its chief rivals. And the burden will be increased by the fact that the abrogation of the Washington agreement leaves the United States and Great Britain free to construct new naval bases in the western Pacific. Already there are intimations that the British are planning to modernize the fortifications at Hongkong, which would serve as a base for the defense of British interests at Shanghai. The creation of strong American bases at Guam and in the Philippines would add considerably to Tokyo's worries, particularly if the Japanese intransigence at London should bring about closer Anglo-American cooperation in the defense of the Western stake in China. Japan has gone too far in North China and Mongolia to turn back without a serious loss of face, and there is little chance that its militarists can be stopped short of war except by drastic international pressure. The framework for such international action already exists in the Far Eastern Advisory Committee of twenty-two nations established by the League in 1933 to enforce its findings in the Manchurian controversy. Collective action of some sort, whether through this agency or a new Pacific security pact, now appears to be the only alternative to rearmament and war.

LANDLORDS HAVE LAUNCHED a new offensive on the embattled share-croppers of Arkansas. More than a hundred persons, including twenty-eight children under six, have been evicted; members of the Southern Tenant Farmers' Union have been blacklisted by the planters; and two share-croppers have been shot. The suddenness and violence of the attack are easily explained. The S. T. F. U. has just held at Little Rock a highly successful convention which was attended by white and Negro share-croppers from six states. The S. T. F. U., which started with only a few members in 1934, now has more than 20,000 members in 200 locals. It has moreover aligned itself with American labor as a whole. The A. F. of L. pledged its strong support of the organization at its convention in October, and one of the speakers at Little Rock was David Fowler of the United Mine Workers, who brought greetings from John L. Lewis. The present attack of the landlords is a direct answer to the militance and enthusiasm of the Little Rock meeting. The landlords and the officials, who are usually landlords also, have determined to wipe out the union before it gets any stronger than it is. The two share-croppers who were shot were both hit in the back—they were undoubtedly "trying to escape"—and later advices tell of threats of lynching and "massacre" if "the damn union" is not dissolved. The share-croppers cannot expect any support from the fact that they are citizens of the United States. The only hope is to arouse public opinion throughout the country and force action from Washington. Wire Secretary Wallace.

FIVE RADICAL EDITORS were subpoenaed to appear on January 17 before District Attorney Dodge of New York for "questioning." Clarence Hathaway, editor of the *Daily Worker*, accompanied by his counsel, Louis I. Brodsky, was the only one to appear. Assistant District Attorney James T. Neary, who asked the questions, was a little vague as to the occasion for them, although he implied that a violation of the criminal-anarchy section of the New York penal code was the point at issue. No representatives of the press were present, and when Mr. Neary refused to name the persons in whose behalf the complaint was made, Mr. Hathaway, on advice of his lawyer, refused to answer. He made it clear, however, that he would be perfectly willing to answer all questions put to him in an open hearing. When the session ended, Mr. Neary proposed a gentleman's agreement to refrain from publicity until he had had time to submit to District Attorney Dodge a transcript of the record—a copy being also submitted to Mr. Hathaway. Mr. Brodsky refused this request also and hastened to tell the story to the newspapermen waiting just outside the door, whereupon Mr. Neary, considerably annoyed, gave out a statement which declared that the attempt to question Mr. Hathaway was part of a six months' secret investigation into the activities of Communist newspapers. It will be recalled that the criminal-anarchy statute referred to was invoked successfully in the Gitlow case in 1919, that it was several times upheld on appeal, and that it was declared constitutional by the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

United States Supreme Court five years later. In other words, if this law is employed to silence the Communist newspapers there will be, to our shame, ample precedent for it. But not even Mr. Hearst or Mr. Ralph Easley, either or both of whom may be responsible for the complaint, may be prepared for the violent protest which will ensue.

CHARLEY JONES of Gamoca, West Virginia, last week told a labor subcommittee of the House of Representatives how he contracted the lung disease, silicosis, from which his three sons have died in the past three years and to which he is now slowly succumbing. About 2,000 men worked in a tunnel near Gauley Bridge, West Virginia, which was being constructed by the contracting firm of Rinehart and Dennis. It is alleged that a large proportion of this number have contracted silicosis, that hundreds have died, and that hundreds of others are doomed because the company, to save money and time, has dispensed with the safety devices which protect workers from the fatal silica dust. The company, it is further charged, has resorted to all possible methods to hush up the story and defeat the suits brought by silicosis victims and their relatives. P. H. Faulconer, head of the contracting firm, maintains that men brought suits who had never been inside the tunnel. We do not see that this answer, even if true, proves the company's charge that the whole affair is a racket for collecting damages. It is quite possible that a few unscrupulous individuals might try to collect money dishonestly even though it entailed a day in court. It is entirely unlikely that 2,000 workers would unite in such a racket; and the fact remains that a large number of workers employed in the tunnel have died. A thorough inquiry is certainly in order.

THE RFC has been successful in the second skirmish of its campaign to drive down the interest rates charged by private bankers in their loans to the railways. Spurred by what it considered to be an unjustifiably high charge in a projected refunding for the Great Northern Railway, the RFC entered the arena by offering to assume the loan at 4 per cent. The bankers withdrew, and it looked as if the government might take over a further large portion of the banking field. The apparent trend toward government financing was quickly checked, however, on January 15, when it was announced that Kidder, Peabody and Company would supersede the RFC in a loan which had already been arranged for the Maine Central Railway. According to the agreement the bankers will buy 4 per cent bonds from the railroad at 98½, leaving them 1½ per cent for underwriting and expenses, and the railway will use $2,424,663 of the proceeds to repay previous advances by the RFC. Shifting the burden of financing back to the private banks is in line with the government's recently launched drive to reduce the excess reserves of member banks from their recent unprecedentedly high mark of $3,310,000,000. As a safeguard against uncontrolled credit inflation, the Treasury has recently withdrawn $125,000,000 of its funds on deposit with the commercial banks, apparently with the view of maintaining increased balances with the Federal Reserve banks. If the Maine Central case can be taken as an indication that the banks have at last seen the necessity of lowering long-term interest rates, it is possible that a part of the huge idle reserves may yet be put to productive use. But it is difficult to see how this surplus can be completely absorbed without either a resumption of foreign lending or a sharp increase in the incidence of social taxation.

HARLLEE BRANCH, second assistant postmaster general, has disclosed further results of the speed tests of subsidized ships which he has been conducting. Under the mail-contract system the amount of bounty is determined by the speed of the ship, and evidence that the Hoover Administration certified speeds that the ships were not capable of making prompted the tests. Of twenty-seven vessels—fifteen of them being the best that the American merchant marine has to offer, including nine Dollar, four Munson, and two United States liners—only four qualified in the tests, and not one of the fifteen was among these. Moreover, of the four, two are old Hog Island freighters whose owners ingeniously fitted them with special propellers which raised their speeds and gave them a subsidy classification intended for ships of an all-round better grade. This practice, the investigation of the Black committee revealed, has been engaged in by other owners; the disclosure emphasizes anew how subsidies have failed to improve the merchant marine. Mr. Branch estimates that the reclassification of the nineteen vessels will save the government about $5,000,000 of the $146,800,000 that is still to be handed over to the shipping barons. Mr. Farley's refusal to knuckle under to the International Mercantile Marine deserves praise. In a test of the I. M. M.'s President Harding, his department, in order to be fair, adopted a formula for the determination of "normal" speed which was less severe than that in long use by the navy and the Shipping Board. The vessel failed to make its required eighteen knots even under this formula. That was in October; since then, in contrast with other shipping companies which conceded the results of the tests, officials of the I. M. M. have lodged a series of personal protests with Farley and Branch. Farley has held firm, and his decision will cost the I. M. M. $187,000 a year.

IT MAY BE that here and there in certain government projects a little questionable boondoggling creeps in; but judging by a report in the January 20 issue of *Uncle Sam's Diary*, a weekly published in Washington, D. C., some federal employees are doing pretty useful work. Under a heading New Facts—From Official Sources, the *Diary* prints the following:

> Work habits of field mice have been clocked by federal scientists: 6 a.m., reveille; breakfast hunting, until after 7:30 a.m.; rest period until 11 a.m.; lunch, 1 p.m.; general nosing about until 2 p.m.; dinner, 4:30 p.m.; half hour for napping, and then to bed at 5 p.m.

And a very good schedule it is—one which the federal scientists themselves, not to mention plain citizens and magazine editors, ought to follow. The lunch hour, to be sure, seems a little short, because one would not wish to cut down too much on the nosing-about period; and the nap just before going to bed might be thought a trifle excessive, although we should be willing to try it for a couple of weeks. But what worries us is this: How do the federal scientists know that the field mice sleep from 5 p.m. to 6 a.m.? Might not a couple of mice, bent on a little night life, get up without being observed by a single federal scientist? If this is to be a really valuable experiment, we should have all the facts.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Uses of Woodrow Wilson

HISTORIC figures seem to have not only their past careers but their present uses as well. Woodrow Wilson has now ceased to be merely our war-time President and a reputed figure in the history of American idealism. He has become a practical weapon with which rival groups are today seeking to bludgeon each other.

The picture of Mr. Wilson that has been emerging day by day from the record of the Nye committee hearings has been tragic and arresting. On January 9 the nation learned of his extraordinary letter to the Secretary of State, in effect permitting the great flood of war loans to begin. On January 17 the Nye testimony contained Lansing's letter to Edward N. Smith, in which the President was revealed—in the very act of campaigning for reelection on a peace platform—as waiting for the right moment in which to introduce a resolution bringing this country into war. Finally came the revelation—which, as Mr. Villard writes on another page, was merely further proof of what had long been known by many—that Mr. Wilson had known more about the secret European treaties than he cared to reveal when he testified before a Senate committee in 1919. Not content with spreading the story upon the record, where it was unmistakably clear, Senator Nye made the mistake of dotting the i's and crossing the t's. He was moved to make an explicit accusation that Wilson had lied.

This was when the storm broke. Nothing in the entire range of the Nye committee evidence—not even the activities of the munitions makers as revealed last year or those of the House of Morgan as revealed a few weeks ago—created as much stir in the Senate as the accusation against Wilson. Perhaps it was that a taboo had been violated: just as in the English law the king could do no wrong, so in American Senatorial mores it is understood that a President can tell no lies. It is possible that more than lèse majesté was involved, that there is in all of us a primal instinct that leads us to rush gallantly to the defense of a dead man since he cannot answer his accusers. However that be, the nation was treated to some excellent oratory. Senator Tom Connally of Texas outdid himself in defending his former leader. Senator Carter Glass of Virginia, a Cabinet member under Wilson, in a speech which has not been surpassed for vitriol since the days when Huey Long and his opponents were enriching the American vocabulary, thundered away as if Senator Nye were Catiline, and pounded his desk with his fist until it bled and had to be taped up. He was treated by his associates with the double honors that go to martyrdom as well as victory.

But we may ask whether it was something more than reverence for a former leader that led to all this blood and thunder. The fact is that this whole Wilson incident represents a strategic blunder on the part of Senator Nye and masterly tactics on the part of the opponents of the investigation. We will grant that an adequate job of educating the nation on the causes of the last war involves publicizing and dramatizing the role of the principal figures in the play. But in the process Senator Nye has provided ammunition for the committee's enemies. As long as the committee confined itself to revealing the part which the profits of industrialists and bankers had played in bringing on the war, Senators might gnash their teeth and wail in silence; they could not openly come to the defense of the victims. Senator Glass could not very well bleed publicly in defense of Mr. Morgan. Those who feared stringent neutrality legislation because it might hamper the flow of American profits during future foreign hostilities could not admit their motives. They waited their time and it looked for a while as if they might get no chance to burke the committee's efforts. But Mr. Nye's attack on Wilson gave them an opening. The pent-up energy of the anti-committee and the anti-neutrality forces was released.

It may be hazarded that the men who were really being defended in Senator Glass's speech were the bankers who had already been called before the committee and the industrialists who were about to be called; and that the real direction of the speech was revealed when the Senator stated that he would not pay out another penny to continue the investigation, and that he felt ashamed of ever having voted any appropriation at all. It may well be that as a result of this blunder in the Nye strategy much of the admirable work which has been done toward achieving strict neutrality will be undone. At least, the hand of any Administration forces for which the Nye committee drive for neutrality has been too zealous will now be strengthened.

Wilson's personality is far more complex than anything that either of the Senators has said and will defy their biographical attempts. It is indeed ironic that, of all the Presidents we have had, it should be Mr. Wilson whose honesty is questioned. His reputed idealism was extremely useful as a halo with which to invest American policy at the Peace Conference. The halo is now completely dissipated. But for us today the thing that stands out most clearly about Wilson is his indecisiveness. He was like the protagonist of a Greek drama, with fate and the gods implacably set against him, and his own purposes too uncertain to prevent the catastrophe. He let the tide of war carry him where it would. He could never quite make up his mind. He sincerely wanted peace—everybody wanted peace—but at the same time he got entangled in the pro-Ally feeling and became a prisoner of the whole set of circumstances that were rushing us into war. The most disturbing thing about the Nye testimony with respect to Wilson is his apparent failure to grasp the terrifying, the irresistible momentum of the forces which, once allowed a start, lead any country on to the doom of war.

The one thing we must do is to keep the Wilson-Nye-Glass incident in perspective. Adequate neutrality legislation must not be compromised by the problem of how unsullied Mr. Wilson's character was, and the same applies (as we pointed out last week) to the problem of Mr. Morgan's personal complicity in the coming of the war. The Nye investigation must proceed on a broadened base of investigation—*but it must proceed.* If the Senators carry out Senator Glass's threat of cutting off the funds of the committee they will show that they are motivated more by fear of disclosures than by reverence for the dead.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The League Falters

IT is now a foregone conclusion that the League Council will take no action, for the time being at least, to strengthen its sanctions against Italy. The excuse given for failing to add oil, coal, and steel to the list of embargoed commodities is that existing sanctions have already weakened Italy and that further action might drive Mussolini into a mad attack on the League powers. Such an explanation can scarcely be taken seriously. While Il Duce has encountered unforeseen obstacles both at home and abroad, he is by no means beaten. The Italian armies have been checked on the northern front in Ethiopia, but this setback has been partially counterbalanced by a brilliant victory along the Somaliland border. The effectiveness of the sanctions now in force cannot even be tested for many months to come. Meanwhile, the danger of a war of retaliation has become progressively more remote. If sanctions are crippling Mussolini's drive in Ethiopia, it is evident that he dare not think of war against a first-rank power.

But all this merely makes the League's failure to extend its embargo the more perplexing. From the standpoint of collective security, it is important not only that Italy be defeated but that the League, once and for all, prove its ability and determination to stop an aggressor. After a brave beginning, however, the League appears to have lapsed into complete ineffectiveness. Nor can this shocking retreat be explained by any single development in the past few months. Most of the League members are as determined as they were in October that the aggressor shall not be rewarded. With the overthrow of Laval now apparently only a matter of hours, France may be expected to be far more favorably inclined toward sanctions. Uncertainty regarding the role of the United States in case of an oil embargo may have contributed to the League's delay, but the chance of action by the United States is now much greater than it was last fall.

Obviously the primary responsibility for the new solicitude toward Mussolini must be placed on Britain's shoulders. Captain Eden's weakness at Geneva is convincing evidence that the late Hoare-Laval plan was not, as Mr. Baldwin claimed, wholly the result of his failure to keep informed of developments at Paris. On the contrary, Sir Samuel appears to have been made the scapegoat for what is essentially the present policy of the Conservative government. His imminent return to the Cabinet in some other post after having been associated with one of the gravest diplomatic blunders in modern history merely reinforces this interpretation. But why should Britain, either because of its avowed desire to uphold collective security or for purely imperialistic reasons, suddenly decide to throw in its lot with Italy? From the standpoint of the Baldwin government there have been only two significant changes in the situation since sanctions were initiated. The first was the result of the British elections. It is no longer possible to doubt that the Conservatives deliberately capitalized the pro-League sentiment revealed by the peace poll in order to be returned for five more years, and then just as deliberately repudiated all their campaign promises. The other development, scarcely anticipated, was the setback which Mussolini has encountered in northern Ethiopia. If Baldwin had really desired to strengthen the League, he would have seized upon this strategic occasion for bringing greater pressure upon Italy. The fact that he did not indicates that imperial considerations have been paramount. Whether this implies that a deal has definitely been arranged or merely that England is loath to see Fascism overturned in Italy is impossible to say, though the latter is the more plausible interpretation. The threat to the white man's prestige in case of an Ethiopian victory has apparently transcended any fear that Italy might threaten the British Empire.

Does this mean that we must despair of achieving anything approximating collective security as long as imperialist rivalries exist? This is the instinctive reaction of most American isolationists, and in view of the events of the past few weeks, no one can definitely assert that they are wrong. It is not enough to say that if it were not for the weakness of Hoare and Baldwin, Italy would today be faced with inevitable defeat. The forces which drove two such dissimilar men as Sir Samuel Hoare and Captain Eden to repudiate the principles upon which they were elected cannot be explained merely in psychological terms. But the alternative to collective security, as the British indicate by action if not by word, is the desperate one of rearmament and a return to the pre-war system of alliances. Unless a collective organization can be established before German Nazism reaches the stage in which Italian Fascism found itself this fall, nothing can head off a world conflict. Fortunately, the outlook is not as completely dark as it appears at the moment. We must not forget that the League has shown that it can act—and act with swiftness and decisiveness. A preposterous plan for rewarding the aggressor has been stopped by enraged public opinion. There is still hope that public opinion will once more assert itself in time to preserve the League from the dry rot of compromise and procrastination.

Remove the Rat

THE president of the World Association of Detectives at its last annual convention stated that "the seeds of unrest . . . particularly the inroads made in organized labor, constitute a major problem with which the members of the association are in daily touch." He went on to say with the pious solemnity of a Rotarian who has just eaten a radical high-school teacher that the private detective performs in this connection "one of the most important services to society."

An excellent example of this service to society is outlined in an article in this issue. Ray L. Kringer reports on page 131 the testimony of a labor spy at a hearing before the Regional Labor Board in St. Louis. The activities of A. A. Ahner, "labor-relations counselor" for the Brown Shoe Company, in destroying union locals from within conform to the usual pattern of labor espionage. The case is of special interest, however, because it shows how the labor spy works hand in glove both with local officials and with the "citizens' committee" which stands ready in all its outrage and sawed-off shotguns to protect the fair name of practically every village and town in the United States—particularly in those rural areas to which industry continues to flee, hoping to escape from organized labor. The Brown Company case is also significant because it puts the labor spy

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and his works into the government records—thereby bolstering the demand now being put forward by various groups for a thorough investigation of what is probably the most loathsome of all professions.

Public opinion, with the help of various agencies, has of late been closing in on the labor spy. This has been due in part to a series of books and articles exposing his methods of dealing with "faults and abuses, such as radicalism, discontent, dishonesty, inefficiency" among workers—we quote from the sales talk of the Pinkertons' National Detective Agency, which has offices in every large city. Edward Levinson, author of "I Break Strikes," and the New York *Post,* which he serves as labor editor, have done admirable work in exposing the private detective as social worker. And there can be no doubt that the trial of Pearl Bergoff, Strike-Breaker Number One, made a deep impression on the public and gave impetus to a campaign to remove the rat from labor's house, which is pretty flimsy at best. Mr. Bergoff's exposure was precipitated when some of his social workers sued him for non-payment for a little trip to Georgia in connection with a textile strike. When the strike-breakers arrived in Georgia, Governor Talmadge, with great éclat but for reasons having nothing to do with pro-labor sympathies, shipped them out again. It made a pretty story in court.

Representative William P. Connery, chairman of the House Labor Committee, is ready to introduce a bill to prevent the use of hired thugs and push through its passage unless the National Labor Relations Board, on the basis of testimony it has collected, can find ways of stopping the practice of espionage.

We do not mean to imply, of course, that the mere passage of such a bill would solve the problem. That would be to overlook the highly respectable gentlemen in steel, automobiles, shoes, and every other industry who by their generous patronage have fostered the noble trade of spying until, according to Mr. Levinson, 55 of the 187 licensed private-detective agencies in New York City now solicit business in supplying spies, professional strike-breakers, or guards, armed and unarmed. Almost any industrial magnate, it seems, would rather share his profits with Pearl Bergoff and his band of "finks" than with the workers who help to pile up dividends.

It would be interesting to know just how many millions have been spent in the last fifty years to keep the worker from getting a fair wage. There is little doubt that steel would lead all the rest. And for this reason it is significant that the office of Charles W. Tuttle in Rooms 1007-1010 of the Carnegie Building in Pittsburgh has quietly folded up. Charles W. Tuttle is known to labor as the chief of the Carnegie spy system which was installed in 1892 by Henry Clay Frick and has been attending to "discontented" workers ever since. Mr. Tuttle, we are told, is "ill." The real explanation seems to be that unfavorable publicity in regard to its espionage service has hurt the Carnegie Corporation.

But even if industry is in process of giving up espionage as a crude and outmoded way of defeating organization, the pressure for a Senate investigation should not be relaxed. The worker has suffered for years from the black list. Let a Senate committee compile a black list to end black lists—a complete record of labor spies, their procurers, and the gentlemen higher up who pay for their services.

Infancy of an Art

THE Museum of Modern Art has recently exhibited to members and to the press the first selection from its newly collected library of motion pictures. By summer it expects to have prepared five programs illustrating the development of the movies from the earliest beginnings to the present, and to offer them on a rental basis to educational institutions for presentation to the public.

Starting with a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation, the Film Library, under the direction of Iris Barry, instituted an active search for early movies, and though many of them survived only by chance, this first showing seems to indicate that the search was remarkably successful. The program begins with "The Execution of Mary Queen of Scots" (1893-94), which lasts only a few seconds and which was originally made for the peepshow kinetoscope but was transferred to film shortly after the first projection machine was devised. It is succeeded by "Wash Day Troubles" (1895), also a mere fleeting incident, and then by "A Trip to the Moon," made in France in 1902 by George Méliès, one of the first persons to establish a reputation as a director. This film is of extraordinary interest both because it represents a successful early effort to use the new medium for fantasy and because it was so widely shown in this country that many persons middle-aged or older can remember it. It is followed by the American "The Great Train Robbery" (1903), commonly cited as the first successful effort to work out a specifically cinematographic technique for the presentation of a realistic narrative, and by "Faust" (1905), one of the early Pathé pictures partly colored by hand. The program concludes with the tiresome "Queen Elizabeth" made in France by Sarah Bernhardt and released in America as the first of the Famous Players pictures. In the next program we are promised some of the early Biograph pictures which dominated the American screen up to about 1911.

As the bulletin of the Film Library points out, the moving picture is the only art which it is possible for us to study from the very beginning. It is also true that if collections had not been made now it would soon have become impossible to make them at all. Films may be copied, as these have been, but their physical basis is not permanent even under proper care, and all the old ones are even now disintegrating. This is particularly true of those not being preserved by companies having a continuous existence, and many have probably vanished completely. We are informed, for example, that the Italian "Caberia," one of the earliest, most elaborate, and most successful of the spectacles (if our memory serves, D'Annunzio wrote the scenario) has so far eluded all search.

These early pictures have a curious interest for even the casual spectator, especially if he happens to be old enough to remember them from the time when they were first shown. But this is not all. There is a real and highly interesting evolution of technique which only they can adequately illustrate. So far, only a small group of persons has been able to see the films, but we hope that they will be shown to the general public. Even this, however, would not be enough. The entire collection should be catalogued and made as easily available to investigators as old books are.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Issues and Men

A Measure of America's Betrayal

TESTIFYING before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, Professor Edwin M. Borchard, of the Law School of Yale University, declared that the chief responsibility for this country's entering the World War rested on the President and the Cabinet because of their utter incompetence in handling the international situation. This he placed above all the other numerous causes for our participating in the struggle. To many who still worship at the shrine of Woodrow Wilson this will seem sacrilege. It is not the worst indictment, however, that can be brought against him. The documents exposed by the Nye committee have now proved the insincerity of some of his Cabinet, in addition to the already attested insincerity of Colonel House and Robert Lansing and the belligerency of Walter H. Page. Of him Mr. Lansing wrote to President Wilson on January 27, 1916: "I must say that I am very considerably disturbed as to Mr. Page's attitude on all subjects which in any way affect the policies of Great Britain. He certainly is influenced very strongly by the atmosphere in which he is, and I frequently doubt whether he urges the cases involving American rights with the force and vigor which he should as American Ambassador." We have also finally obtained indisputable proof of what has long been known—that Mr. Wilson lied in regard to his ignorance of the secret treaties.

I have always had a special interest in this question, for it was I who first received copies of the treaties and printed them in January, 1918, in the New York *Evening Post,* of which I was the managing owner. Copies of these treaties I personally sent to Mr. Tumulty. Colonel House, who now appears as having obtained knowledge of these treaties only from the President during Balfour's visit, received several copies, as did every Senator and Congressman. I syndicated the treaties in eight or nine dailies, and reprints of them in pamphlet form were placed on sale on the newsstands of New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Chicago, Washington, and other cities. A friend of mine has stated to me that he has in his possession a letter from Colonel House acknowledging receipt of two copies of the pamphlet and declaring that they are "going to the White House tonight in the private mail bag of which the President alone has the key." Yet Woodrow Wilson, when the Senate committee called upon him on August 19, 1919, specifically denied having heard of the secret treaties before he reached Paris.

Arthur Krock, Washington correspondent of the New York *Times,* joining his employers' effort to discredit the Nye committee, declares that "maybe he [the President] did lie." "There are," he declares, "lies forced upon statesmen by patriotic duty which are writ in letters of gold in the books of the Recording Angel." As I have not seen the Angel's books, I cannot be sure that Mr. Krock is correct in his statement. But I can and do challenge his assertion that any such lie was "forced upon" Wilson "by patriotic duty." What was that "patriotic duty"? The war was finished; the fight then on was over the League and the ratification of the peace treaty. All the President desired to achieve by his words was to hide from the Senators the fact that, before his trip to Paris, he had knowledge of those abominable secret treaties which prove today, as in 1918 and 1919, that the supposedly noble and altruistic aims of the Allies were all bunk. Of course, Wilson would have been denounced had he told the truth; he would have been accused of withholding vital facts from the Congress and the people—facts at the basis of the Versailles treaty, which has so nearly wrecked the world. Does the Recording Angel glorify a statesman's lie told simply for the patriotic purpose of saving his own skin?

But this is only one phase of the appalling picture now for the first time revealed in full by the Nye committee; for which alone Senator Nye—and Senator Clark, too—well deserves the award of the Cardinal Newman gold medal, to be bestowed upon him by the Newman Foundation for the most outstanding and distinguished service rendered to our country and to humanity during the past year. Professor Borchard was right. The incompetence is all there. It is exceeded only by the utter callousness of the Wilson crowd with respect to the price in human lives and suffering to be paid by the youth of America for governmental cowardice and blundering—130,128 men killed, or dead of wounds or sickness. I do not recall any Cabinet speeches against our going into the war for prosperity's sake—no one knew then that the price might not be 500,000 or even 1,000,000 American lives. So the incompetent Wilson enmeshed himself and the country by being insincere in his neutrality and then unneutral, by going back on his original ban against loans and the sale of Allied bonds, by permitting the growth of the huge war business until he was its captive and unable to oppose the British in their violation of international law lest he destroy our unhealthy war-boom prosperity. The Nye committee has now reconstructed the whole thing, made past history live news, and laid before us just how we were led by cheating and blundering into the struggle.

Well, how about a balance sheet? Had we stayed out of the war we should have lost our war business, experienced a depression and considerable unemployment, and failed to make a lot of millionaires. Instead, we got 130,128 dead and 192,369 wounded, a war expense of at least fifty billions with more billions to come for bonuses, pensions, and so forth, the loss of our loans to our Allies, our share of the present depression with its horrible toll in money and manhood, and, finally, national insecurity with our republican institutions actually menaced. This is the true measure of America's betrayal by the incompetence, the insincerity, and the devotion to "prosperity" of Page, Lansing, McAdoo, House, and Wilson!

Oswald Garrison Villard

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Riddle of the Supreme Court

I. The Divine Right of Judges

By MAX LERNER

A LONG view of the power of the Supreme Court is difficult to achieve in the midst of immediate issues and angry passions. But it would start with the fact that what the court is doing now, in smashing the best legislative efforts of the community, is no novelty, just as the attacks on the court are no novelty. It would try to get at the nature, the psychological roots, and the economic consequences of the power of judicial review—presumably America's most beautiful and original gift to the art of government.

Judicial review is a political device by which the court passes on the constitutional validity of legislative and executive acts. It enables the judges to apportion powers between the states and the national government, and between the legislative, executive, and judicial branches. This is a power nowhere to be found expressly granted in the Constitution itself. But it has by this time written itself into the Constitution by court interpretation, and although only a custom it has become as commonly accepted as if it were clearly granted in the document.

There are two opposing theories as to how the power grew up. One is the usurpation theory. It goes back to Jefferson and is repeated afresh in every period of constitutional crisis. It holds that judicial review is sheer usurpation and that the Supreme Court has deliberately filched powers belonging to other departments. This point of view is generally highlighted with charges of tyranny that transport us back into the pages of Plutarch. The other is the Federalist view that the judicial power flows inherently from the nature of our federal system, and that without it our government would be unworkable and our democracy unthinkable.

I shall confess I cannot subscribe to either of these theories, although they both offer fragments of the final answer. It is true that there have been some men on our court with a will to power. And it is true, on the other side, that given our federal-state governmental system, when both the states and the nation try to ride the same horse someone must finally decide who shall ride in front. But a clearer answer than either would be that the court's power is a natural outcome of the necessity for maintaining capitalist dominance under democratic forms; that judicial review has proved to be a very convenient channel through which the driving forces of American economic life have found expression and achieved victory. Such a view could be documented by reference to the history of the judicial power since Marshall first established it in 1803 by his decision in Marbury *vs.* Madison. The high points in the story would be Marshall's use of the judicial power to give enlarged scope to the expansion of business enterprise, the development of the doctrine of due process of law after the Civil War, and the reading of a laissez faire social philosophy into the Constitution in the decades around the turn of the century.

Today the court is reenacting the role it has always played whenever a resurgence of popular feeling has threatened to sweep away some of the established power of business enterprise. Nor has there been in all this any consistency of judicial doctrine or political theory. When the people have gained control of the state legislatures, as happened in Marshall's day and in the decades of agrarian revolt, the court has denied power to the states and concentrated it in the federal government. But when, as is true now, the people have captured the federal offices, then the court denies power to the federal government and reserves it where it must be ineffective in the task of business regulation—with the state governments. The Republicans now find themselves amazingly the devoted adherents of states' rights, and the Democrats (shades of the Jeffersonian tradition!) are earnestly seeking to increase the national power.

There are several rather striking misconceptions today about the court's power and function. One is that judges decide as they do because they can do no other—that they follow an inflexible path of constitutional doctrine. Only a little less far from the truth is the second and opposite misconception—that the judges are untrammeled in the expression of their own social attitudes and that they can play ducks and drakes with judicial precedent. What are actually the limits within which the Supreme Court has to work? It can decide only specific cases and not abstract questions—the case of the Schechter brothers, for example, and how they sell their chickens—and out of those specific judgments the body of constitutional law grows up. Once a case is settled, however, a rule of law is established for future decisions, and every judge must abide by it (*stare decisis*) regardless of his previous views. The court works, moreover, within a difficult technical tradition, under a limited jurisdiction, and with severe procedural regulations. Finally, its role with respect to legislation is negative and passive. It can initiate nothing of itself. But after you have said all that, the fact remains that the judge retains a great latitude of decision. On the same set of facts in the Hoosac case, after hearing the same arguments and reading the same briefs, with the same body of precedent to draw on, possessed of the same degree of integrity and patriotism, Mr. Justice Roberts comes to one constitutional conclusion and Mr. Justice Stone to exactly the opposite one. What can explain this? Only the hypothesis that the judge works within limits and with material flexible enough to allow for personal choice. The *determining* factor becomes not some rigorous rule but the judge's own social philosophy. This in turn is shaped by his class roots, his education, his experience, and the elements in the contemporary climate of opinion to which he is responsive.

There is another misconception. We tend to believe that the court shows its power only when it declares an act of Congress unconstitutional. Actually the court has exercised this judicial veto only on some sixty occasions, many

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of them of slight moment. The judicial veto represents the outer limits of the court's power. It shows how far that power can go. But usually the court influences the shaping of an act even before it is passed, for the knowledge that the act will have to run the gauntlet of judicial review is a sovereign acid for eating away features that the court will predictably disallow. Once the act is passed it may be whittled into ineffectiveness (as happened with the anti-trust legislation) without any actual declaration of unconstitutionality, or the agency set up (like the Federal Trade Commission) may be crippled by court interpretation without being destroyed outright. Thus the court's power is broader and more continuous than the exercise of its veto. Even when it upholds legislation it is directing our economic life. The entire landscape of life as it is lived today by the common man is ultimately at the mercy of the court's action or sufferance.

The essence of the court's position in our system is that it takes problems that are primarily economic and clashes of interest that are economic, and translates them into terms of legal doctrine. It thus becomes the bottle-neck of economic policy. I believe that is the one overwhelming fact that we must face today. As long as economic issues are fought out frankly as such, their solution lies with the people and with their representatives in the legislature. But when economic issues are translated into legalistic terms, when the question of the fate of the farmers and workers and housewives and working children becomes a matter of hosts of none-too-angelic lawyers dancing on the needle of due process of law, then the big electoral battalions are left helpless. If we face it clearly, looking beyond the tangle of our traditional usages, the question of what we shall do with our farms and our factories is not ultimately a question for lawyers or judges to settle. It is a question of economic and social policy. To allow our economic policy to be shaped by the judges is wrong whichever way you look at it. If they decide, as is often claimed, on purely legal grounds, then those are the *wrong grounds* on which to decide questions of economic policy. If they decide, as is sometimes admitted, on economic and social grounds, then they are the *wrong people* to be intrusted with decisions on these grounds, for they are judicial and not economic technicians.

In passing thus on economic policy the Supreme Court has throughout our history functioned as the last bulwark of the possessing classes. It has always been a final line of defense for them, a sort of Hindenburg line that would stand fast when all else crumbled. Beaten at the polls, in danger of having the economic institutions of a plutocracy leveled by the political forces of a democracy, the defeated group has always turned to the court for shelter and has found it in the safe haven of constitutional law. Jefferson discovered this fact when he and his party of small farmers and mechanics turned the Federalist propertied interests out of Congress and the Presidency in 1800, only to find them dug in again behind the earthworks of the court. Jackson discovered it in the 1830's, Lincoln in the 1850's, the agrarian leaders in the eighties and nineties, the Progressives such as La Follette and Theodore Roosevelt as the century ended. And now Mr. Roosevelt is discovering it afresh. It seems to be the fate of American reformers to conduct their education in public.

Each of these men sought to attack the court. In no case has the court's power been successfully limited. What accounts for this extraordinary toughness and viability of the court? The defenders of the court answer that its survival indicates the hollowness of the attacks on it. What is involved is evidently a medieval ordeal by fire, proving innocence. But the successive crises of the judicial power can no more be exorcised by this sort of mumbo-jumbo than can the crises of the economic system. Each attack on the judicial power in America has not been merely an unaccountable bit of behavior of the democratic mass. It has been the expression, in constitutional terms, of the inability of our state to adjust its own power-relations and resolve its own contradictions. And for that reason each successive crisis of the judicial power has taken its color, its substance, its tension from the contemporary stage of the struggle of economic groups and classes.

That is happening today too. And today, as in the past, the court will survive the attack on it, not because of any inherent rightness in the judicial power, but because the larger number of our people still have a sense of the sanctity of the court. What used to be the divine right of kings has now been replaced by the divine right of judges.

There are several elements in this pattern of divine right as it exists in the popular mind. One is the fact that we have been encouraged for over a century to make a fetish of the Constitution. Every people needs some form of anchorage, some link with the invariant. The Rock of Ages is as essential to political as it is to religious life. In fact, the habits of mind begotten by an authoritarian Bible carry over to an authoritarian Constitution; and a country like ours, in which our early tradition had prohibited a state church, ends by getting a state church after all. To be sure, not all who make a fetish of the Constitution believe in it. There are many newspaper and political groups which appeal to the sanctity of the Constitution with their eyes fixed on the immensities and their hands reaching out for their own special interests. And yet with the larger number of our people the belief that the Constitution is sacred beyond change is a genuine belief, and must be reckoned with.

The second psychological element in the tradition of the divine right of judges is the belief that the Supreme Court is the special guardian of the Constitution—and a better guardian than Congress or the President. Part of John Marshall's genius lay in his skill in pushing into the background the power that the court was gaining over economic policy, and thrusting into the foreground its role of guardianship. This the later judges have encouraged by their continued utterances, and it has become the official theory of the court's power. The judges have thus been associated in our minds with the function of protection rather than with the struggle for power.

The third element has been the tradition of judicial neutrality. We have somehow placed the judges above the battle. Despite every proof to the contrary the common man attributes to them the objectivity and infallibility that are ultimately attributes only of godhead. The tradition persists that they belong to no economic group or class; that they are not touched by economic interests; that their decisions proceed through some inspired way of arriving at the truth; that they sit in their robes like haughty gods, unaffected by the prejudices that move common men.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

How long a myth built of such baseless fabric can continue is another matter. It is undoubtedly weakening and may be expected in the end to crumble. Meanwhile, however, its force and its hold on the popular mind are enough to daunt Mr. Roosevelt and keep him from making an open attack on the court's power. In the end it will not be the Roosevelts who will restore to the popular will the power of deciding on economic issues. The Supreme Court may be expected to be its own bitterest enemy. Even the myth of the divine right of judges will not survive many more decisions like Mr. Justice Roberts's masterly essay in obfuscation in the Hoosac case.

Arms Over Europe

V. Mussolini Outbluffs England

By LOUIS FISCHER

Rome, January 3

ALL Rome is divided into three parts: the servants of the Pope and God, who wear cassocks and do not mix in politics; the servants of the King and Mussolini, who wear military uniforms and are paid to obey orders; and the civil servants of the dictatorship. Somewhere in every French political discussion one person will say: "Ah, but Paris is not France." Nor is Rome Italy. It is more prosperous-looking, more politically-minded, and more pro-Fascist than the rest of the country. And it is filled with designated and voluntary propagandists for the regime whose charm and eloquence put foreigners under tremendous, often irresistible intellectual pressure.

With this reservation, one must recognize in Rome that the League of Nations sanctions have for the moment consolidated Mussolini's domestic support. When active war preparations commenced, the nation opened its mouth for the first time in thirteen years and complained and criticized. The Ethiopian war was not and is not popular in Italy. Soldiers have failed to report at the time of embarkation for Africa. Many citizens in the north have crossed into foreign territory, and numbers have endeavored to prove foreign citizenship. In the presence of His Excellency Crollalanza, a high Fascist dignitary, who was showing me the fine work of reclaiming the Pontine Marshes, I asked a Fascist official why he was not in East Africa, and he replied, "One war was enough for me." There was opposition to the war in government bureaus, from the general public, among workers—Genoa saw some strikes—and in the army. In 1932 Mussolini instructed the General Staff to draft a plan for an Ethiopian war. The military warned that such a campaign would require at least three years of intense fighting and much expensive preparation. It would, moreover, weaken Italy in Europe. This was the narrow view of experts; Mussolini knew the political and social reasons for a war. In the beginning, therefore, many army leaders sulked. The King too was disaffected. When Mussolini's picture flashed across cinema screens scarcely a hand applauded. No longer did crowds gather in the Piazza Venezia to demand that Il Duce appear on the balcony.

Sanctions were a windfall. Mussolini is a consummate politician. Anti-British feeling was fanned by the press. Though not at all menaced, the British Embassy was surrounded by troops when sanctions were imposed. They served to point out the enemy to the populace. The opposition beat a retreat. Thereafter the regime stressed the hostility of foreign powers to Italy instead of Italy's hostility to Ethiopia. A special cookbook appeared with the title "Economical Meals for Sanctions' Time," not war time. This is typical of Mussolini's shrewd strategy. The whole world has combined against Italy; Fascism played on the nationalistic chord. Inveterate anti-Fascists at home and abroad placed themselves at the disposal of the regime. Even the royal family fell into line.

In Rome I asked every Fascist and every foreign military attaché I met why Mussolini had decided to make war with a huge army instead of taking a page out of the Japanese book and provoking a plausible incident which would warrant intervention or bribing some chiefs to declare themselves autonomous and beg Italy for assistance. Some Italians replied that such methods were not worthy of a proud nation. Signor Edmondo Rossoni, member of the Grand Fascist Council, said they feared a second Adowa. But a force of 50,000 men equipped with tanks, cannon, and aeroplanes could prevent a repetition of the 1896 disaster. Actually the size of the Italian army in Ethiopia is encumbering its progress. In explaining the lull on all fronts Marshal Badoglio declared, "Soldiers must be fed"; and the more there are of them the slower becomes the advance. Moreover, we know that Italy did buy tribal leaders before the war started. Baron Franchetti purchased the submission of Ras Gugsa and several other chiefs prior to the opening of hostilities; and it was because the British disliked Franchetti's activities, Italians privately assert, that the aeroplane in which this Venetian Jewish nobleman was returning to Rome met with a mysterious and fatal accident fifteen minutes after it left the Cairo aerodrome. Be that as it may, the question remains why Franchetti's approved tactic was not applied more widely.

When Anthony Eden visited Rome in June, 1935, he offered Mussolini Ogaden north to the eighth parallel and west to the forty-second meridian. But Mussolini demanded all non-Amharic territory, plus control over the Negus such as the French exercise in Morocco over the Sultan. Knowing he could not get this with British consent he suggested that if he made war he would take the entire country, and he moved his hand around and around above the map of Abyssinia which lay in front of them. In Paris, in August, Italy was offered more territory than Eden had been ready to grant, and also special advantages which might, in time, have enabled it to absorb other large parts of the land. Such a scheme would not have antagonized Britain and the League or taxed Italy's limited financial resources. Mussolini spurned it.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Everything points to the same conclusion: the Italian regime thought that at home and abroad there was more to gain from fighting than from negotiating, from battles than from bribes to princes. This also must be considered: Italy had a peace-time army of 250,000 to 300,000 men. Mussolini's principle, the moment troop shipments started, was to replace every soldier who went to Eritrea with another for duty in Italy. Since the East Africa army today numbers approximately 250,000 (plus 35,000 laborers), one would expect the home army to consist of between 200,000 and 300,000 men. But its actual strength is 900,000, perhaps 1,000,000. Did Mussolini wish to be prepared for a war in Europe; did he expect a world-wide conflagration? Or was he dealing with another problem, the problem of unemployment and domestic unrest? Despite the fact that a million men joined the army in 1935 and that many more found work in munitions plants, there were 628,000 Italian unemployed in September, 1935. There may have been almost two million, then, before the war started—a large number in a poor country of 44,000,000 inhabitants. After circumstances had convinced the government of the advisability of a war, this factor could hasten the final decision and give the war its large-scale, grandiose character. It has already militated against an early peace.

When I asked seasoned observers what would happen in Italy if, a month or two from now, peace were reestablished, they all agreed that "things would be pretty bad." "The majority of Italian soldiers in Abyssinia," Rossoni had said to me, "will naturally return home, for many of them are city people with roots in Italy." There would be more unemployment. The war had so far solved nothing. What Italy may get in Ethiopia now or in the near future cannot yield quick fruit. On the other hand, every day of war costs the Italian nation, it is stated, 30,000,000 lire which it can hardly afford. Sanctions are taking their toll; hoarding, speculative buying, a few price increases, and general economic dislocation have begun. On October 16 Mussolini disclosed his terms to Laval for the first time since the trouble commenced. He wanted all non-Amharic territory, with League control, through foreign advisers, over the rest of Abyssinia. This was less than the British and French foreign ministers proposed. On the whole, therefore, the Laval-Hoare proposition presented him with a difficult choice.

Before Mussolini made up his mind he sought to analyze the minds of Laval and Hoare. The case of Laval presented little difficulty. Laval had blessed Italy's invasion of Ethiopia, by implication at least, on January 7, 1935. He had been dragooned into sanctions by the British. He disliked making an enemy of Italy because of some African waste lands. But what of Hoare? Were not the British bent on being firm? Had they not mobilized half the world for their struggle with Mussolini? Why the volte-face? Britain indubitably wished to reassert her might but soon discovered that this involved a strain and a risk. The crisis came over oil sanctions. Laval had caused them to be postponed once, but the League Committee of Eighteen was scheduled to meet on December 12 to decide for or against applying them. I spent the nine days preceding that date in Rome, and Rome talked of nothing else. Italy, I was told, possessed several months' reserves of petroleum, but oil sanctions must ultimately paralyze her military and industrial activities, and Mussolini, Italians added—sometimes a bit hysterically—would not allow himself to be trapped and destroyed in this base manner. He would fight. He would fight the whole world. "This will be a romantic form of suicide," I suggested. "Yes," came the reply more than once, "but it is better to go down in a blaze of glory than to die inch by inch under foreign pressure." Then military experts and Fascists went to the ubiquitous map of the Mediterranean. "You see this island?" they would say. "It is called Pantelleria. It lies just between Sicily and Tunis, forty-five miles from Sicily. Italian submarines and aeroplanes could close that gate and lock out the British fleet in the western Mediterranean. Italy could then fight in the eastern part for a long time. Italy has more bombers than you think. The Italian airmen are intrepid and expert. Recall Balbo's formation flight to America. Italo Balbo is in Libya. Look at this map. You see this circle? It represents the range of Italy's bombers in Libya. You notice that the circle includes Alexandria. From the Dodecanese Islands Italy can bomb Cyprus. In the British House of Lords it has been admitted that Malta is already worthless. Italy can do a lot of damage." A particularly frantic Italian contributed these ideas: "If all hope is lost, we will smash everything within our range. Is it better to lose India than Ethiopia? England will regret all this. We will all go down together. We will become a nation of brigands. I will become a brigand." At the moment he was the elegantly dressed director of a big commercial establishment. Was all this merely talk? It impressed diplomats in Rome. It impressed Laval and Hoare as well.

Other facts fill out the picture of the Laval-Hoare proposal. The terms were sent to Mussolini on December 10. On December 12 the constitution of 1923 was returned to Egypt. Sir Samuel Hoare had asserted at the Guildhall banquet in November that the constitution had been dropped. Riots followed on the Nile. Few realize how serious the situation might have become if Mussolini, as part of a "smash-all" decision, had marched a small army from Libya into a disaffected Egypt. It would have been difficult but possible. Egypt is part of the Mediterranean front, but it is really a front in itself, and it has played a large role in the formulation of British policy toward Ethiopia. Moreover, what might a desperate Mussolini do on another British front, on the German front? There were rumors of a rapprochement between Mussolini and Hitler. Just before sanctions were applied, Mussolini had warned Laval that he might, if pressed, alter his policy with respect to Germany's position in Austria.

Difficulties in Egypt, dangers to the Mediterranean fleet, possibilities in Germany, and, as Baldwin said in the House, "it is no easy matter to stop oil going to Italy," particularly when the United States failed to apply an embargo. London consequently faltered. The upshot of it all is this: Mussolini, with a very bad hand, played such wonderful poker that he succeeded, for one moment at least, in bluffing John Bull, whose cards were much better but who was afraid of going in for excessive stakes. In fact, the stakes are not big; Mussolini could not hold out very long against England and France. But if Mussolini is pushed to the wall, Europe and Italy will become even more interesting and exciting than they are today.

[A sixth article by Mr. Fischer on international relations in Europe will appear in the issue of February 12.]

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Last War and the Next

II. What Does Neutrality Mean?

By WALTER MILLIS

THE problem of neutrality, as it has now at last been posed before the nation, is a problem in applying the uncertain lessons of a complex past to the control of policy in an unforeseeable future. Its difficulties should be obvious. Yet the first and most fundamental lesson of our experience in 1914-17 is still the reasonably simple one that in order to maintain American neutrality America must be neutral. It is useless to discuss the question of keeping the country out of another foreign war except upon the assumption that the war will be one which the country will believe that it should keep out of. The nation—which is to say, those influential and vocal elements that so largely determine the current attitudes and momentary expedients of government—must at least begin with a conviction that the foreign conflict is not our conflict and, what is more important, that its outcome is a matter of no overwhelming importance to the United States.

The folly of the President's attempt to found a policy of neutrality upon the assumption that 90 per cent of the world is peace-loving by nature and that any foreign war must spring from an immoral aggression on the part of the dangerously wicked 10 per cent is surely too plain for discussion. It was precisely that attitude which was the deepest single "cause" of our entanglement last time. If in another crisis it is adopted by our powerful captains of industry and our greatest financial magnates, by the corporation lawyers who normally staff the higher reaches of the Administration and its foreign services, by our press lords and the rabble of college presidents, professional interviewees, and other lay preachers who follow in their train, and by the professional politicians who sway to the winds of such influences, then the United States will not be neutral. In spite of whatever Presidential proclamations of neutrality may be issued, there will soon appear again a tremendous combination of pressures blocking every attempt to free the country from the war complex and strengthening every force tending to establish it; it is unlikely that any abstract legislation adopted in peace time would withstand the tide, and again, as before, the issue of an actual military participation in the conflict would doubtless depend before long upon external circumstances which we should be powerless to control.

No neutrality legislation can guarantee in advance that the country will be neutral when the actual crisis appears. One may even go farther and say that if the country were genuinely neutral, the old-established laws and precedents would largely suffice, and it would be a relatively simple matter to secure any new powers from Congress as the need for them arose. Even in 1915 President Wilson could readily have got an arms embargo from Congress had he wished to do so; while as late as 1916 he had to exert all his influence to *prevent* the passage of the Gore-McLemore resolutions, which would have withdrawn protection from citizens traveling in the maritime war zones, as the present neutrality measures propose to do. There is, indeed, a certain danger in writing too drastic neutrality laws upon the books beforehand; for there is always the possibility that political or economic pressures, or simply some concatenation of events unforeseen when the laws were drafted, may force their repeal, and the neutral state is certainly far more directly compromised by the repeal of legislation already in force than by a simple failure to enact such legislation.

Yet this by no means demonstrates the futility of such legislation. Rather, it serves to define more precisely the real ends which a neutrality act can hope to accomplish and the basic objectives at which, in consequence, it should be directed. Two things such an act can, perhaps, achieve. The first is to set up in time of peace large, plainly lettered, and inescapable warning signs, informing the populace and in particular its bankers and business men, editors and politicians, that if in another foreign crisis they set out to drive the nation recklessly and at top speed down the road to war, then war is the place where they are most likely to end.

This function of a neutrality act is admittedly more educational than immediately practical; but it is not for that reason an unimportant one. It is to be suspected, indeed, that it is by far the most important function which a peace-time act can perform. Mr. J. P. Morgan has just informed the Nye committee that the fact that the Allies "found us useful" in mobilizing in their behalf the financial and economic power of the American people in a major struggle in which the American people supposed themselves to be neutral is still "the fact of which I am most proud in all my business life of forty-five years." A mandatory embargo on loans to belligerent governments—which there are various possible means of evading—might not prevent Mr. Morgan from again rendering so great a service to a foreign power. It might, however, lead him very seriously to consider what he was doing before a second time devoting himself to such a cause; and it should certainly impress upon him a far livelier sense of the public responsibility attaching to his private actions than he now seems willing to admit.

Similarly, restrictions on commodity exports might easily break down in practice, but their existence should nevertheless force the ordinary manufacturer and farmer, the politician and the newspaper reader, to face this basic question of neutrality at the beginning. Indeed, the mere debate over such measures is already doing so. In a new book Mr. Allen W. Dulles and Mr. Hamilton Fish Armstrong have discovered that an American export embargo might work to promote a conquest of China by Japan or "weight the world against the kind of government to which the United States is dedicated" by facilitating a victory of the German and Italian dictatorships over Franco-British democracy. For this reason they are, perhaps rightly, skeptical of commercial embargoes. But far from demonstrating the futility of such embargoes as a neutrality measure, this only demonstrates that in the given cases Messrs. Dulles and Armstrong would not wish to be neutral. In this way, the presence of a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

strong embargo act upon the books might compel the country as a whole to decide, at the outset, whether its primary purpose was to maintain neutrality or to maintain the territorial integrity of China or the military security of France and Britain in Europe. If the decision is in the latter sense, then neutrality of course becomes a dead issue, and the only problem is the practical, though somewhat ignoble, one of seeing to it that as far as possible other nations do our actual fighting for us. But the neutrality act will have helped to insure that the decision is recognized for what it is, made clearly and consciously, and based upon some more rational concept of genuine national interest than the emotional reactions to the first waves of war hysteria.

This is the first possible function of peace-time neutrality legislation. Assuming that the country does meet the foreign-war crisis with a conscious policy of genuine neutrality, there remains the second function which such legislation can be expected to perform. Not the least significant lesson of our last experience is its demonstration that the outbreak of any modern great war must be an instant and violent shock to our own economy, indeed, to our whole established complex of "national interests." On July 24, 1914, the United States, though suffering from a business recession, was moving comfortably enough through a world which seemed to present no issues graver than the pasteboard problems of party politics; by August 4 we were facing financial collapse and economic disaster while we were swamped under a deluge of lesser difficulties any one of which would have been a major sensation by itself in normal times. So another great war is certain to create, at its outbreak and during its further progress, a complex of problems which American statesmanship will be called upon to solve. The second possible function of peace-time neutrality legislation is to prepare as well as may be solutions which will not include the final confession of diplomatic bankruptcy represented by a resort to war.

Here the first obstacle to be recognized is the difficulty of anticipating the exact conditions which will be presented. If the foreign war is such a minor one as that between Italy and Ethiopia, it will present no problem; but if the legislation is designed only to meet such a major war as one between the League powers and an Italo-German combination, then it may be perverted, as the neutrality act of 1935 was perverted, to entangle the country in the minor conflict which it was not intended to cover. Legislation providing against another major European war—which would almost necessarily repeat the 1914 situation, with one side overwhelmingly predominant at sea—would hardly apply to a Russo-Japanese conflict, in which each belligerent could doubtless keep its back door open to American imports; while a world war in which Japan joined the Central Powers and perhaps Italy against Great Britain, France, and Russia would present complexities not easy to analyze in advance.

In other ways the problem would be quite different from what it was in 1914. For technical reasons it is doubtful whether the submarine can ever again play as nearly dominant a role as it did in the spring of 1917. On the other hand, the aeroplane, in conjunction with the submarine and mine, has put the old-fashioned "close" blockade out of the question, and so rendered inapplicable the great body of international law and precedent on that subject. Maritime war zones—the new concept which we so sternly rejected in 1915—would seem to have become a military necessity, though a legal apparatus for regularizing them scarcely exists at present. In the economic no less than in the military field significant differences may be anticipated. For one thing, we possess a much stronger munitions industry than we had in 1914, which will of course be thirsting for profits; and that extremely important branch of it which manufactures aeroplanes and aeroplane engines commands an extraordinary popular sympathy and support never accorded the makers of the more pedestrian instruments of slaughter. We now have a considerable merchant marine under our own flag; its existence will make it more difficult for a foreign sea power to control our commerce, as the Allies did from 1914 on, but will at the same time increase the risk of explosive incidents. On the other hand, the trend toward national self-sufficiency leaves the whole future position of international trade and its importance to our domestic economy in some doubt; while other powers lack the cash and collateral resources available to them in 1914 for mobilizing American industry in their behalf.

With so many unknown variables present, it is impossible to solve the equation in advance. Particularly is it futile to attempt to search out every point at which a controversy with one or the other of the belligerents might arise, and provide against each by a specific waiver of neutral "rights" or a specific commitment to observe more exacting neutral "duties." The provisions of the Pittman bill, authorizing the President to withdraw protection from nationals trading with or traveling to belligerent countries, might under certain circumstances prevent the development of some kinds of controversy, but there are many possible kinds of controversy which they do not cover, and circumstances could easily arise under which an unwise use of the power would invite trouble. Their real value is simply as an instrument for impressing upon the country the fact that all neutral "rights" are more or less shadowy substances with no final sanctity attaching to them, and that it is always within the discretion of any government to grant or withhold protection to its citizens abroad, not in accordance with the desires of the citizens but in accordance with the broad ends of national policy and interest. With such a statute on the books the Executive faced with another Lusitania crisis—or with the threat of it—would have a means which President Wilson lacked for controlling the tremendous emotional forces involved. It seems unlikely that legislation can, in this field, do more; and the Pittman bill doubtless does this well enough.

But the fact that last time we acquiesced in many Entente violations of our claimed "rights" which we probably would not have tolerated for a moment from the Germans seems sufficient proof that the controversies themselves are of minor importance. It is not to the elimination of the inevitable surface frictions that one must look for the real safeguard, but to preventing the development of deeper explosive forces which these frictions might ignite. Here is the most significant, and obviously the most difficult, task before the author of any neutrality legislation. What he must prepare for is a sudden and violent dislocation, in quite unforeseeable directions, of the whole established political and economic framework. The first impact upon the United States might, as last time, cause a severe economic depres-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sion; it might come in the form of a sudden and unhealthy prosperity. The emotional impact would certainly be a powerful one and probably of first importance in the development of later events; and one cannot help asking whether peace-time legislation, by considering questions of propaganda, communications, and so on, could not usefully give more attention to this phase of the subject. But so far Washington has concentrated its efforts primarily upon the economic aspects. How can present legislation discourage the reappearance of a great "vested interest" in the success of one side in the struggle, tying our own economy in with that of one belligerent, inciting the other to attack us and exacerbating the emotional force of every controversy with him, tending to bind the hands of the government in its efforts to control the situation, and perhaps forcing us at last to come to the rescue of the favored side in order to save our own economic skins?

Clearly, the broad answer seems to be by preserving as nearly as possible our normal peace-time economic relationships. Today, as throughout the long history of neutrality, the ideal solution is to secure the maintenance of our normal trade relationships with both belligerents; and because even now certain quite possible war situations might present a balance of forces that would enable us to maintain them, one must look with suspicion on too hasty and complete a surrender of the older concepts of neutral rights. For this reason, if for no other, mandatory embargoes on the primary commercial exports seem to be ruled out, for however they might work in practice they would necessarily destroy at the outset the normal economic system. If the outbreak of the war struck us first, as it did last time, through a loss of foreign trade, mandatory embargoes would merely intensify the suffering and heighten the pressure for relief through an abandonment of neutrality. Permissive authority to embargo commercial exports, however, would be a powerful weapon in the hands of a skilful and determinedly neutral President for defending our commerce against belligerent interference and so maintaining more or less the status quo ante. The trouble is that one cannot count on a President who would be both skilful and neutral, and if he failed in either respect the result might be disaster.

Though in the case of, say, a Russo-Japanese war we might be able to maintain our normal commerce with both belligerents, it seems unlikely that the most skilful President, with the widest authority, could do so in the case of another general European war. The problem becomes therefore one of providing the means for adjustment to a situation not exactly foreseeable and probably of a rapidly changing character. Again the mandatory commercial embargo is ruled out, for it is impossible to make adjustments with a rigid instrument. The mandatory embargo on loans to belligerent governments, which places a kind of extreme upper limit upon any adjustment through an abnormal expansion of war exports, is doubtless valuable. It must be recognized, however, that the possibility of evading it or of breaking it down—as happened last time—through resort to the mechanisms of commercial credit, triangular or private loans, cannot easily be guarded against except at the cost of destroying the financing of ordinary trade. And if it sets an upper limit upon the development of an unhealthy war trade, it provides no lower limit to check a war depression.

Aside from the mandatory embargo on actual munitions —a question which seems to be of relatively minor consequence—about the only other device in the present bill for controlling our economic relationship to the war is the permissive embargo on commercial exports. Except as a threat, however, this power seems at once too feeble and too sweeping to be of great practical use. On the one hand, it is difficult to prevent its evasion by the routing of exports through some other neutral country; on the other hand, if it could be made effective it would in a great war be too dangerous to our own export trade to be put into operation. While it cuts off excessive exports to one side, again it offers no means of recouping the loss of exports to the other. Some more subtle instrument seems necessary, and it has been searched for in a rationing or quota system. It has been suggested that legislation, either permissive or mandatory, should confine commercial exports to belligerents to the pre-war average. Yet in this simple form it is still open to most of the same objections. There is still the problem of exports by way of neutrals; if this were met by extending the quotas to all countries, the gap left in our export trade by the cutting off of certain belligerents would remain. When great foreign trading nations, moreover, find their energies absorbed by war, their former customers must apply elsewhere. For a neutral United States this would offer a legitimate increase in exports, and one from which it would be very difficult to withhold our own producers.

What seems to be wanted is some flexible instrument for the control of our foreign trade in war time which, while maintaining an upper limit on our *total* exports to all nations somewhere near the pre-war level, will permit of a wide range of readjustment within this limit as between both neutral and belligerent powers. To construct such an instrument is not easy. The experience of the European countries with quota controls during the depression may suggest means of going about it; the enactment of a simple permissive embargo law now may provide a foundation upon which the necessary refinements can be erected. But at all events, it will take much more time and thought than are available in a hurried session at the beginning of a Presidential year to build real machinery for the control even of the economic factors in a war crisis. Perhaps the real point of the whole present neutrality debate is simply its indication of the complexity of the subject, and our immense lack of concepts, public instruments, and popular understanding necessary to begin to deal adequately with it.

But there is one other lesson to be derived from the argument. And that is that while permissive powers seem unavoidable in any attempt to deal with an unpredictable future, any permissive power carries with it as great a danger of misuse as a hope of successful application to the end intended. If the President is to have power to deal with such violent situations as are here anticipated, they must be real powers, and that means that they must be as powerful for ill as for good. It is to be suspected that the ancillary as well as the possible direct advantages of neutrality legislation outweigh the dangers; but the dangers are there, and the only final safeguard against them lies in the American people's ability to understand its own objectives and control its own governmental agencies for their attainment.

[*This is the last of two articles by Mr. Millis on The Last War and the Next.*]

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Washington Weekly

By PAUL W. WARD

Washington, January 19

THE Supreme Court's cardinal function, beating the living with the bones of the dead, has just been taken over for a few hours by the United States Senate, with results threatening an abrupt end to the munitions investigation and defeat to the exponents of a more rigorous neutrality bill than the Administration desires.

Ostensibly, all this has come about because the blundering Nye wounded the feelings of Tom Connally, Carter Glass, and other Wilson idolators by impugning the honesty of Harding's predecessor. Actually, many other forces contributed to the Senate flare-up that followed. There is a nasty story going around Washington to the effect that the Nye committee was about to present certain evidence—a matter of recent aeroplane salesmanship in relation to a foreign power—that would strike close to the present occupant of the White House.

It is known that the committee has in its secret files certain data that, if disclosed, would be embarrassing to Mr. Roosevelt. But it is far from certain that this circumstance had anything to do with starting the current effort to end the munitions probe by refusing Nye's committee the $5,000 to $10,000 needed to complete its job. On the other hand, it is clear that something more than worship for Wilson's memory moved some of those who supported the outraged Connally and Glass in their absurdly vituperative attack on Nye and his work. There is no doubt, for example, that malign advantage was taken of the situation by a number of Senators who are opposed to any form of neutrality legislation that would put restrictions on cotton, oil, or metals shipments to belligerents beyond the reach of political manipulation.

Nor can there be any doubt that others welcomed the opportunity provided to yield—under cover of an assumed love for Wilson's shade—to pressure from their Italian-American constituents in respect to neutrality legislation. Members of Congress, especially those from New York and New Jersey, have been subjected to heavy pressure of that kind in the last week. Delegations from Italian sections of the East have descended on the Capitol bearing promises of reelection for Congressmen who see to it that any neutrality legislation enacted at this session exempts the Italo-Ethiopian situation. To do otherwise, they argue, would be what the diplomats call an "unfriendly act." Persons closely following the progress of the neutrality legislation in committee report that this newest of Washington lobbies already has made some progress. Though the artichoke and tomato kings who make up this pro-Duce lobby will probably not succeed in their basic effort, they may achieve their secondary aim, which is to see that there is no stringent provision with respect to embargoes on raw materials in the bill that Congress passes. Nye's blunder will have helped them there.

* * * *

IRONICALLY, the storm of invective that blunder loosed in the Senate held up action on the bill to indemnify the Americans who physically paid the price of making the world safe for democracy. When the storm broke, the Senate galleries were jammed with representatives of all the veterans' organizations, come to see their two-billion-dollar bonus bill rushed through the Senate for the next to the last time. They confidently expect Roosevelt to veto the bill and have even sent word to him that such an act will not be held against him by their followers at the polls in November. They expect, just as confidently, to pass the bill over his veto. His legislative field marshals, including Speaker Byrns, who in the past has always voted against the bonus, are all hurrying to get their names down as supporters of the current bill, after failing in their efforts to obtain from the White House instructions as to what position the Administration wants them to take.

Morgenthau, who as Secretary of the Treasury is at least nominally in charge of the federal government's purse, also was barren of instructions when he appeared before the Senate Finance Committee a few days ago to discuss the budgetary situation. Thanks to Senator Couzens, who holds to an old-fashioned belief that the government belongs to the people and that they have a right, therefore, to know what it is doing, we now know that even in the opinion of the Secretary of the Treasury the federal credit is approaching a perilously strained condition that must be checked either by reductions in spending or by an increase in taxation. Roosevelt still thinks he cannot afford the latter. The nation cannot afford the former. And under typical Rooseveltian management the nation will get neither in any substantial degree.

* * * *

WHILE on the subject of finance, I should like to direct attention to one phase of the New Deal in banking that has just been completed. When the nation's banking structure came tumbling down in 1933, one of the edifices that crashed with an especially loud roar was the huge First National Bank of Detroit. Later a Senate investigation was to show that the structure ought to have been razed months, if not years, earlier if its depositors and countless investors were to be protected from the results of the financial manipulations practiced by the banking group's operators. They had dealt lavishly with themselves in loans to finance their speculations in the bank's shares and in real estate, and then had resorted to every trick their lawyers and accountants could devise to hide the bank's condition and keep the dollars of depositors rolling in and their own loans from being called.

In the end, of course, those tricks were of no avail, and the institution was thrown into receivership. Out of the resulting liquidation it has been possible to pay the depositors amounts totaling no more than 70 per cent, and long ago it became necessary to turn to the directors for collection of their statutory liability, amounting to $29,000,000. Since the bank's directorate of 110 members included all the leading industrialists of Detroit and dummies representing virtually all the big automobile corporations, since these interests, according to their latest statements, have again grown rich and fat about the exchequer, since some of the men involved are millionaires many times over, and since under the law

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they were individually as well as collectively liable for the whole $29,000,000—you naturally would assume that Mr. J. F. T. O'Connor, Comptroller of the Currency, would insist upon payment of the entire amount. But you would be wrong. Mr. O'Connor has just settled for thirteen cents on the dollar, or a total of $3,800,000.

What is more, the compromise settlement was made the occasion of a sort of public jubilation in the federal courtroom at Detroit, to which it had to be taken for formal approval by Judge Edward J. Moinet. All the parties to the compact, including the Treasury's lawyers, the directors' lawyers, and Judge Moinet, joined in praising one another. After sealing away from "gossips" the documents that would show how the compromise was reached, who paid what and who paid nothing, Judge Moinet, a Coolidge appointee, topped off the proceedings with a windy speech in which he eulogized the men responsible for the bank's crash and assured all within sound of his voice that no more honest men ever trod the earth. Neither he nor the Detroit press, whose headlines screamed "Banking Group Gets Clean Bill" and "Bankers Vindicated by Court," even mentioned the fact that a number of directors in question have been under criminal indictment since June, 1934, for multiple violations of the National Banking Act.

* * * *

IT is probable that only a nasty, suspicious mind would perceive any parallel between these happenings at Detroit and certain phenomena exhibited at the Jackson Day dinner here and the meeting of the Democratic National Committee that followed it. In a place of honor close by the President and immediately next to the Vice-President of the United States at the dinner sat J. Bruce Kremer, who back in 1933 patriotically had yielded to the Roosevelt edict that no New Dealer should attempt to cash in on membership in the Democratic National Committee. Mr. Kremer yielded by giving up his committee post and setting up a luxurious law shop here directly across the hall from a similar establishment opened by Arthur F. Mullen, another committeeman who agreed with Mr. Roosevelt.

How right they were, at least from the standpoint of usefulness, has been proved several times over. Mr. Kremer, freed of the responsibilities of representing Montana on the committee, was able last summer to render $5,000 worth of services to one of the power consortiums fighting the Administration's holding-company bill. And it has just been disclosed that he was successful last summer in persuading the Department of Justice, under his old pal, Cummings, to approve a $250,000 payment to the claimants in settlement of the fifteen-year-old Niowa-Shipping Board case. In two earlier Administrations the department had refused to honor the claim.

While Mr. Kremer has been busy with such matters, Mr. Mullen has been similarly occupied. Mr. Mullen, who represented Nebraska on the committee and was a Roosevelt floor leader at the 1932 convention, collected $25,000 from power interests for aiding them in their fight against the Administration's holding-company bill. A few months ago it was revealed that he was seeking a fee in the neighborhood of $175,000 from two Nebraska public authorities for services rendered in connection with the establishment of two PWA-financed power projects in that state.

The best part of it all is that Messrs. Kremer and Mullen have found a way of eating their cake and keeping it too. Both these men, whose resignations from the national committee contributed so mightily to the Roosevelt Administration's early reputation for moral and political probity, took an active part in the committee's deliberations the day after the dinner. Kremer attended on a proxy from Alaska. Mullen was there on a proxy from Puerto Rico. Robert Jackson, of New Hampshire, another who preferred the role of political lawyer to a committee post, also was in attendance. His son-in-law, W. Forbes Morgan, had succeeded him as committee secretary. Frank Hague, the New Jersey saint, was there, too, along with Horatio J. Abbott, whom Secretary Morgenthau forced to resign as Collector of Internal Revenue at Detroit under charges that his collectors were gathering campaign funds instead of taxes. Near them sat William A. Julian, who somehow never heard Mr. Roosevelt's call for all public office-holders to get off the committee. Mr. Julian occupies an even more obscure role than that of the Vice-President. He is Treasurer of the United States.

Loose Construction

By HEYWOOD BROUN

THE broadcast entitled "Liberty at the Crossroads" which the two big chains refused was a most interesting radio revelation of Republican psychology. It contained a mother-in-law joke which was undoubtedly inserted to show that the G. O. P. is faithful to the ancient traditions of this country, and there was also a mildly off-color anecdote to preserve the Lincolnian approach.

But chiefly I was interested in Chairman Fletcher's estimate of the intelligence of the average voter. In one of the sketches, if they may be dignified by such a name, two characters, John and Mary, are introduced as "typical young Americans." John's recurrent phrase is "Huh? Sure." He describes an expected wedding gift as "a bedroom soot." The existence of such a thing as a national debt comes to him as a complete surprise. He is utterly amazed when he is told that he himself is a part of the government. As a matter of fact, he can hardly be blamed for that after some recent Supreme Court decisions.

But all in all John Albert Smith is presented as a complete moron and his fiancee, Mary Phoebe Jones, as a young lady who has not yet quite made that grade. This in the eyes of the Republican National Committee is a typical American couple. The sincerity of Dr. Fletcher's belief in this state of affairs is illustrated by the fact that John is solemnly advised that the farmers of America will be completely ruined if they receive high prices for their products. Mr. Fletcher has a touching faith that the average American is all set to say "Huh? Sure" to any economic hand-me-down the G. O. P. has to offer. But isn't there at least a chance that the line may be revised to read, "Huh? Not on your life."

* * *

I THINK there may be some passing interest, too, in the identity of the author who wrote "Liberty at the Crossroads" entire, jokes, economic theories, and everything but the music. He was born in Iowa and his name is Henry

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Fisk Carlton. Mr. Carlton was an instructor at the University of Missouri and after service in the war took Professor Baker's English 47 at Harvard. He wrote a play which was produced on Broadway, and in 1925 became an instructor in English at New York University.

But at this point one cannot help making the inquiry: "Why, I thought the Republican Party was all against the professor in politics. Haven't I read somewhere that we are being led to our doom by the crackbrained theories of Ph.D.'s from Columbia and Harvard?"

On closer examination I find that Mr. Fletcher could easily make an adequate reply. Henry Fisk Carlton is only an M. A. and an instructor. He has all the book learning the Republican Party can afford to use and even at that he has to stoop a little.

* * *

WALTER LIPPMANN, plutocracy's favorite Pippa, finds that all's well with the world now that the Supreme Court's in its heaven and the Triple A has been killed. "The court has cleared the way for a far better agricultural problem," he writes. Mr. Lippmann has just discovered the problem of erosion, and he thinks we should have more scientific farming with the cultivation of legumes to hold the soil. He does not deal with the point that this will involve the constitutionality of the TVA and the even further question of whether the court would ever conceivably allow the government to manufacture low-priced phosphate fertilizer at Muscle Shoals and sell it directly to the farmer. There will be precious few legumes unless this is done.

Mr. Lippmann thinks the Supreme Court would certainly approve any law to promote really scientific farming "under the general-welfare clause." He asks naively, "What can be more truly a national interest than to preserve an agricultural population capable of feeding and clothing the American people and of conserving the land upon which the whole future depends?"

What, indeed! But I trust that Mr. Lippmann, in this Pippa phase of his political economy, will not continue to leap so blithely across the deep grave dug by the six stalwarts of the High Bench. If he had taken the trouble to turn the page he would have found the *Herald Tribune* in its leading editorial pointing with pride to the discomfiting words of Mr. Justice Roberts, "It [the Agricultural Adjustment Act] remains a means for effectuating the regulation of agricultural production, a matter not within the powers of Congress."

Of course Mr. Lippmann may argue, and argue very eloquently, that words may mean anything you want them to mean; indeed, that they mean two utterly divergent things if that happens to suit your convenience. But I would refer him to the words of Senator Norris, a man not unfamiliar with the ways of Congress or the courts. Before the Senate Agricultural Committee Senator Norris said, "I don't believe that if the Supreme Court decision stands we can pass any law to regulate agriculture."

That is certainly what the court said. I trust that Mr. Lippmann is not going to join its critics and detractors by subtly suggesting that it was only playing politics and that it has one ruling for a Democratic Administration and another for a Republican.

Correspondence

Cats, Dogs, and Children

To the Editors of The Nation:

In your issue of January 8 you furnish us with an arresting editorial stating that a contributor of the Englewood *News* (December 12, 1935) reports that about one hundred starving families of that wealthy suburb are gleaning scraps of food along with the homeless dogs and cats.

Just to add to the grim humor of the affair, I will report that a number of my friends, seated around a bridge table some two weeks after the incident referred to, heard one of Englewood's affluent first ladies confess that she was organizing a local branch of the Association for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals to look after homeless dogs and cats.

Would it be pushing inference beyond its legitimate office if we presumed that the light of publicity had stung Englewood's best people awake to a sense of social obligation to dogs and cats? That hungry dogs and cats should have to contend with children on the garbage heap for scraps of food should overwhelm our best citizens with a sense of shame.

New York, January 3 Ben Howe

"Let Not Farmers and Planters Rise"

To the Editors of The Nation:

Apropos of your comment in the January 15 issue of *The Nation* on the Supreme Court AAA decision, we wish to call to your attention a poem written by a Jeffersonian critic of Federalist policy in 1798. Had the writer been a prophet as well as a poet, he might have dedicated it to Mr. Justice Roberts.

Let us always the poor beat down
And raise the rich to high renown
Lord if to this you don't agree,
We shall all on a level be—
And none will rev'rence the high blood,
Which do forbid we pray dear Lord.
Let not farmers and planters rise
To rank amongst the great and wise.

This was reprinted in "Essays in Honor of William E. Dodd," edited by Avery Craven, in the essay by Maude Howlett Woodfin on Contemporary Opinion in the Virginia of Thomas Jefferson.

Benjamin B. Kendrick
Mary Catherine Proctor

Greensboro, N. C., January 13

"Help Build Palestine"

To the Editors of The Nation:

Your editorial on McDonald in the issue of January 15 studiously omits his profound appreciation of Palestine as the one positive hope for German Jewry and the spiritual emancipation of world Jewry. Liberals who do not cooperate with the Zionist cause subtly betray their liberalism and stamp their philo-Semitism as a selfish gesture. Keep your compassion; help build Palestine.

Burlington, Vt., January 9 Ludwig Lewisohn

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Labor and Industry

How to Break a Labor Union

By RAY L. KRINGER

St. Louis, January 17

THE story of how the Brown Shoe Company smashed the unions in its plants in small towns of Illinois, Indiana, Tennessee, and Missouri was told by the present writer in *The Nation* of November 13. In that article the president of the International Boot and Shoe Workers' Union was quoted as follows: "It seems as though some hidden hand was able to bring about a situation which resulted in the return to our general office of the charters sent to locals." The "hidden hand" has now been fully disclosed in a hearing before the Regional Labor Board in St. Louis, which has issued a complaint charging the company with discrimination in firing four union employees in its Salem, Illinois, plant and with "inducing a Citizens' Committee to coerce, intimidate, and interfere with the employees in the exercise of the right" to organize and bargain collectively. Twenty-one days were required to take the testimony; and the 3,600-page transcript tells a sordid story.

John A. Bush, president of the Brown Company, testified that when he hired A. A. Ahner as "labor-relations counselor" he did not know Ahner was the head of a strike-breaking agency. The manufacturer explained that Ahner was employed in the spring of 1934 to relieve company officials of details incident to meeting with employees under Section 7-a of the National Industrial Recovery Act; he was not hired to break unions.

Termination of Ahner's connection with the shoe company happened to coincide with the dissolution of most of the locals of the Boot and Shoe Workers' Union in Brown plants. The locals in the Sullivan, Illinois, and the Charleston, Illinois, plants gave up their charters in August, 1935; the Mattoon local was dissolved the following month and the Salem local was disintegrating. Ahner's thirteen months' employment by the Brown Company at $200 a month ended in September, 1935.

Ahner was engaged by President Bush of the Brown Company following a conference at which the "private detective" impressed the manufacturer as a "square-shooter." Bush declined to reveal who recommended Ahner. Compared with his nationally known competitors, Ahner is small fry—but judged by the growing list of his clients in the St. Louis area he is winning recognition. Ahner testified at the Labor Board hearing that he is sole owner of the A. A. Ahner Detective Agency and of Industrial Investigators and Engineers. He admitted that he received his training in the employ of the Railway Audit and Inspection Company, rated in the class of the Bergoff strike-breaking agency. Ahner went into business for himself about seven years ago. "It's worth lots of money to me," he testified.

Although Ahner's men were described by a former employee of his agency as a "slugging outfit," finesse rather than violence was employed for the most part to discourage membership of Brown Company workers in the Boot and Shoe Workers' Union. M. L. Norris, a union organizer in Salem, bore the brunt of the violence which occurred. On one occasion Norris was lured from his home at night by a fake telephone call and slugged by unidentified assailants who ran their car against his and started an altercation. Norris "missed being killed by an inch," a physician testified. Several weeks later Norris was besieged in his home by a mob and threatened with a "one-way ride."

During the siege of the Norris home Police Commissioner George James of Salem called and requested the union organizer to turn in the charter of the shoe workers' local so that the Brown Company would not close the factory, as it had threatened to do. James was a member of the Citizens' Committee which took a leading part in the effort to kill the union movement. The Citizens' Committee also included Mayor Omer McMackin and leading merchants.

Mayor McMackin's testimony was one of the high lights of the hearing. On October 14, during a strike at the Salem factory, the Mayor assembled a group of special deputies and gave them orders to "stop that picketing by 11:30 a.m." McMackin acted after a telephone conversation with President Bush of the Brown Company in St. Louis. Several pickets were clubbed and kicked.

"Were your instructions to stop picketing in conformity with the laws of Illinois?" asked David Shaw, attorney for the Labor Board.

"Yes," replied the Mayor, and went on to explain that the law he had in mind was "one that says two or three persons, in an emergency, may be construed as a mob."

"Do you realize," pursued Attorney Shaw, "that there is a provision in the Constitution giving the right of freedom of assembly to citizens of this country?"

"When it comes to the courts that law doesn't stand in Illinois," was the answer of Mayor McMackin.

When asked to elaborate on his theory that "two or three may be a mob," Mayor McMackin explained that he wouldn't consider people gathered for an ice-cream social a mob, nor would he consider as such the gathering of members of the Citizens' Committee at the country club.

Among other witnesses for the shoe company was T. H. Lawyer, former president of the disbanded Sullivan local. After Lawyer's testimony that he was "always in hot water" with company officials, a rebuttal witness told of overhearing a long-distance telephone conversation between Lawyer and Walter Ekins, general superintendent for the Brown Company, on the night the Sullivan local burned its charter. Lawyer's part of the conversation was reported as follows: "Hello, Ekins. Yes, I did the job. I did what I told you I would do—burned the charter. About 200 voted in favor of it. I will never let them organize in this factory again. No, there is not much you can do for me." A few weeks later Lawyer moved to St. Louis and was given a job as salesman for the Brown Shoe Company. Ekins admitted that the company kept a paid spy in the Salem factory.

Clarence J. Gullion, president of the Joint Council of the Boot and Shoe Workers' Union, testified that Ahner once told him that the Brown Company "would give $250,-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

000 to be rid of the union." The witness said that he took the remark as a "gentle hint that someone could sell the union to Ahner for that much."

Evidence brought out at the hearing showed that the Citizens' Committee kept up a constant barrage of petitions, statements, and threats to discourage membership in the union. In one instance a chain-store manager fired the father-in-law of the Salem union chairman because, it was testified, the store "wished to remain neutral in the trouble at the shoe factory." The breach of neutrality on the part of the store employee apparently occurred when he extended the hospitality of his home to a union organizer. The store manager, however, admitted that he himself attended meetings of the Citizens' Committee.

Salem union employees swore that factory foremen warned them that "they are going to do you exactly as they did the people in the other plants. The Brown Shoe Company does not intend to have unions in its plants." Citizens' committees functioned in Sullivan, Charleston, and Mattoon. They became most active after Ahner was hired by the shoe company as "labor-relations counselor." A member of Ahner's staff, Harry Widman, was placed in charge of labor at the Sullivan and Charleston plants. Widman worked in Sullivan with the Citizens' Committee, which hand-picked employees for the factory when it reopened after a brief shut-down in August, 1935. Factory shut-downs in Mattoon and Charleston because of "lack of orders" afforded merchant members of the citizens' committees opportunities to apply their greatest pressure upon union workers, by withdrawal of credit. It was after such lay-offs that unions in these two towns voted to turn in their charters.

Government Attorney Shaw requested at the close of the hearing that the voluminous transcript in the case be sent to Washington to allow the entire National Labor Relations Board to issue a ruling.

8th Printing!

SEX HABITS

A VITAL FACTOR IN WELL-BEING

By A. Buschke, M.D. and F. Jacobsohn, M.D.
Specializing Physicians to the Great Continental Rudolf-Virchow Hospital

Foreword by Gerard L. Moench, M.D.
Associate Professor of Gynecology, New York Post-graduate Hospital, Columbia University

11 Full Pages of Photographs

SUBJECTS EMBRACED

THE SEX ORGANS (Male, Female)
SEX INTERCOURSE (Analysis, Nature, Methods, Frequency)
SEX DIFFICULTIES (Adjustment, Technique)
MARRIAGE (Sex Aspects, Instruction)
VALUE OF REGULAR SEX INTERCOURSE
SEX HYGIENE (Precautions, Directions)
THE SEX IMPULSE (Contrasted: In Men, In Women)
SEX VARIATION (Physical, Psychological)
VARYING SEX PRACTICES
SEXUAL SHORTCOMINGS (Impotence, Frigidity, Sterility, etc.)
SEX DANGERS (Coitus Interruptus, Reservatus, etc.)
SEX ABNORMALITIES (Perversion, Sadism, Masochism, Fetichism, Exhibitionism, Homosexuality, Hermaphrodism, etc.)
REPRODUCTION, FERTILIZATION, HEREDITY, EUGENICS

THIRTY ILLUSTRATIONS

THE SEX ORGANS OF MEN (4 plates,* 15 illustrations)
THE SEX ORGANS OF WOMEN (3 plates,* 6 illustrations)
THE PROCESS OF REPRODUCTION (1 plate,* 3 illustrations)
FERTILIZATION AND DEVELOPMENT (1 plate,* 2 illustrations)
DEVELOPMENT BEFORE BIRTH (2 plates,* 4 illustrations)

* Full-page.

PRESS COMMENTS

"Most individuals will profit immensely by reading every word in this book, because it is based on a thorough understanding of the sex life of both men and women."—Journal of the American Medical Assn.*

"This work on the sex life, a collaboration by two outstanding specialists, gives admirably and simply the facts necessary for a practical understanding of the sex impulse, the sex organs and the sex act. It contains a valuable and beautiful collection of photographs."—Private Hospitals.

". . . The sanest and most practical views of sexology and sexual hygiene that can be found. A clear conception of the male and female reproductive organs can be obtained. The description is accompanied by a set of beautiful photographs of the various organs. A finer set could not be found in any anatomy book . . . "—Glasgow University Publication.

". . . gives those facts essential to a correct understanding of sex and a very accurate and scientific account . . . and has the added advantage of being illustrated." — Medical Times (London).

* The membership of the A. M. A. consists of approximately 100,000 physicians.

Price $2.50 (postage 15c extra)

EMERSON BOOKS (Dept. 323-N) 333 SIXTH AVE., N. Y. C.

Facts for Consumers

THE financial statements of the big packers make particularly interesting reading this year because of the packers' frequent protestations that high meat prices are bad business for them as well as for consumers. Wilson and Company had one of the most successful years in its history, with sales aggregating $223,000,000 against $100,000,000 for 1934. The reduction in live stock caused by the drought and the AAA resulted in only a 5 per cent decrease in the total volume of meat handled. Armour and Company also fared well. Sales increased from $564,000,000 in 1934 to $683,000,000 in 1935, or approximately 21 per cent, although the tonnage handled was 3 per cent less than the year before. If the $9,791,172 reserved for the now void processing taxes is added to the company's net profit of $9,377,849, it will be seen that Armour had indeed a gala year. It was the consumer who footed the bill for the drought.

* * *

FINAL argument in the now famous complaint of the Federal Trade Commission against the Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company was heard last week. The commission contends that All-State tires made by Goodyear for Sears, Roebuck and All-Weather tires distributed under the Goodyear name are "entirely comparable," although the former sells for less. Goodyear, of course, denies this, and in its argument makes several points which consumers will find interesting.

The president of the company acknowledged that "there is no such thing as a first-line tire." A satisfactory standard of value, as far as the ultimate buyer is concerned, would be determined by mileage in actual performance, but such a standard is now admitted to be an impossibility. One of the engineers testified that despite careful control of specifications 300 per cent variability in performance was possible. Why, then, should the consumer pay attention to anything but price when buying a tire? As the *Consumer* suggests, "A tire is a tire, and differences between hundreds of makes are becoming less significant."

Goodyear inferentially conceded this when it argued that it was entitled to charge more for All-Weather tires because it had spent a fortune in advertising the Goodyear name. "We believe," said one of the company's lawyers, "that the showing of the total amount expended in respect of advertising for the full history of the company is relevant as giving some measure of that value which is given to Goodyear dealers in the sale of Goodyear tires and not to Sears, Roebuck in the sale of a tire to Sears, Roebuck." This "value," which obviously bears no relation to quality, amounted to some $72,000,000. It appears, then, that the price charged the consumer is determined not by comparative value but by how extensively—and expensively—a tire is advertised.

The Goodyear matter is a test case for the Federal Trade Commission. In its decision the commission and eventually the courts will pass on the legality of selling identical merchandise at one price when it is nationally advertised and at a lower price when it is distributed under a private brand name through a chain store. Whether a decision against Goodyear will actually benefit consumers by price reductions is questionable.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In commenting on the case the *Consumer* points out that a 25 per cent price differential between "first-line" Sears, Roebuck tires and Goodyear tires was suddenly decreased to 10 per cent. "One store," it says, "attributes the change in differential to a suggestion made by the Chase National Bank, connected with both Sears and Goodyear."

If the adverse publicity given Goodyear by government agencies continues, the rubber company can soon be expected to cry that it is being persecuted. A few days before the FTC hearing, Secretary of Labor Perkins made public the report of a fact-finding board which held that the company was wholly unjustified in attempting to extend the six-hour working day to eight hours, that it did not fairly enter into negotiations with its employees, and that the reduction in the cost of tires would be at the expense of the workers and would be negligible as far as the consumer was concerned.

Radio and newspaper puffing of another tire manufacturer, the General Tire and Rubber Company, makers of the "new general dual balloon tire," is deflated by a complaint issued by the FTC. Claims that the new tire is "blowout-proof" are alleged to be untrue.

* * *

IN its annual report the Federal Trade Commission makes two recommendations which, if carried out, would greatly increase its ability to protect consumers. Both are the outgrowth of experience in particular cases. The Marmola case of five years ago, in which the United States Supreme Court ruled that the commission had no authority to interfere with the sale of an admittedly harmful drug because no unfair competition had been proved, undoubtedly prompted the present suggestion for an amendment to Section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act to prohibit "unfair or deceptive acts and practices in commerce" as well as unfair methods of competition. Section 2 of the Clayton Act, under which action was brought against Goodyear, should be clarified, the commission suggests, so as clearly to "define the discrimination in price intended to be forbidden." The section now expressly permits variations in price which are the result of "differences in the . . . quantity of the commodity sold."

* * *

THE distributor of Bab-O, the B. T. Babbitt Company, has agreed by stipulation with the FTC "to stop asserting that Bab-O banishes dull film, water lines, or the most stubborn dirt instantly, that its use ends all scouring and scrubbing, that it will not harm nail polish and will soften hands, that Bab-O was discovered by scientists or is a new discovery."

* * *

THE Consumers' Division has again been transferred, this time to the Department of Labor. The record of play now stands—NEC to NRA to Secretary Perkins's DOL. According to Walton Hamilton, who continues as director, the transfer does not in any way affect the work or policies of the Consumers' Division. Long-time plans which cannot be completed for several years are being made by the division, indicating that the consumers' representatives in Washington now have a feeling of greater permanence. One of the first projects is to be a study of housing and house-furnishings, with the development of standard specifications. Projected also is a plan for the compilation of all available specifications for consumer goods, and their publication in conveniently sized booklets. Under Dr. Hamilton the division has shown a commendable independence, but it has not yet tested its strength against powerful commercial interests.

RUTH BRINDZE

[*Facts for Consumers appears every other week in* The Nation. *Miss Brindze cannot answer questions in regard to the merits of individual products.*]

OYEZ! OYEZ!

Current interest in the Supreme Court and its decisions is so high that we have reduced from $4.50 to $3.00 the price of the volumes described below.

Does Congress or the Supreme Court control our welfare? Do you know what effect the Supreme Court has had on the development of this country? For an intelligent understanding of this vital issue of the day, read "the most fascinating book this month has produced." (John Chamberlain in THE NEW YORK TIMES).

HISTORIC OPINIONS of the UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Edited, with Introductory Notes
BY AMBROSE DOSKOW

This volume contains, in full, in convenient form, the epoch-making decisions of the United States Supreme Court from the days of John Marshall to the decisions in the "Gold Clause" and N.R.A. cases—pronouncements which have shaped our government and have influenced the life of every American. Further, this work presents an epitomized history of the country as revealed in the judgments of the supreme tribunal of the nation. In the introductory notes, which precede each opinion, is given not only the general background of the controversy, both political and economic, but also the significance of the decision at the time it was rendered and its effect on us today.

OVER 550 PAGES

DISSENTING OPINIONS OF MR. JUSTICE HOLMES
"Only lawyers and litigants usually care to read what judges write, but this book is literature"—Zechariah Chafee, Jr., in THE ATLANTIC MONTHLY.

REPRESENTATIVE OPINIONS OF MR. JUSTICE HOLMES
"The reader who wishes to understand fully the working of Justice Holmes' mind will find it indispensable"
—THE NATION.

SOCIAL and ECONOMIC VIEWS of MR. JUSTICE BRANDEIS
"Here is contained much more than law, namely, a philosophy of civilization."—L. M. Page in THE ANNALS of The American Academy of Political and Social Science.

These volumes are on sale at all bookstores at the new low price of $3 each. The four volumes, boxed, are $10.

THE VANGUARD PRESS

Mail this coupon to your bookseller or to:
THE VANGUARD PRESS,
100 Fifth Avenue, New York City

Send me the volumes checked below:
.....HISTORIC OPINIONS OF THE U. S. SUPREME COURT $3.00
.....DISSENTING OPINIONS OF MR. JUSTICE HOLMES $3.00
.....REPRESENTATIVE OPINIONS OF MR. JUSTICE HOLMES $3.00
.....THE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC VIEWS OF MR. JUSTICE BRANDEIS $3.00
.....The four volumes, boxed $10.00
☐ I enclose check or money order ☐ Send C.O.D.

Signed.....
Address.....
City.....State.....

When writing to advertisers please mention The Nation

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Books, Drama, Films

Revisitation

By SIEGFRIED SASSOON

What voice revisits me this night, what face
To my heart's room returns?
From that perpetual silence where the grace
Of human sainthood burns
Hastes he once more to harmonize and heal?
I know not. Only I feel
His influence undiminished,
And his life's work in me and many, unfinished.

O fathering friend and scientist of good,
Who in solitude, one bygone summer's day,
And in throes of bodily anguish, passed away
From dream and conflict and research-lit lands
Of ethnologic learning—even as you stood
Selfless and ardent, resolute and gay,
So in this hour, in strange survival stands
Your ghost, whom I am powerless to repay.

A New Poet

Theory of Flight. By Muriel Rukeyser. With a Foreword by Stephen Vincent Benét. Yale University Press. $2.

"THEORY OF FLIGHT" is one of those rare first volumes which impress by their achievement more than by their promise. It is remarkable poetry to have been written by a girl of twenty-one, and would do credit to most of her elders. Miss Rukeyser has assimilated many of the best things in the modernist tradition, without aping any particular writer or school of writers, and also without seeking technical innovation as an end in itself. Her originality consists in making something new and making it well with the tools at hand, rather than in devising new instruments for others to use.

Unlike most very young poets, Miss Rukeyser is not primarily a lyricist, although her lines sing when there is occasion. Her poems not only present and celebrate experience but evaluate it. Here is a well-stored, vigorous mind attempting to bring its world into some kind of imaginative and human order.

The earlier poems are concerned with the writer's status as a young person. They make articulate the child's reactions to school, her parents, death, love, and the war, adding comments from a later wisdom:

> Allies Advance, we see,
> Six Miles South to Soissons. And we beat the drums.
> Watchsprings snap in the mind, uncoil, relax,
> the leafy years all somber with foreign war.
> How could we know what exposed guts resembled?

Elsewhere she seeks to define her relation not to her personal history but as a twentieth-century American to her cultural heritage. She is able to justify the blood, to establish "continuance" with the American dream, but only by turning against its traditional forms, in a way that to her forbears would have seemed like treason:

> Oh, we are afflicted by these present evils,
> they press between the mirror and our eyes,
> obscuring your loaned mouths and borrowed hair.

The poems in which she develops this thesis are among the most moving in the book, and were evidently conceived in some anguish of spirit. In place of the sophomoric rebellion that might have been expected from one of her age, there is the formulation of a revolutionary attitude that is carefully reasoned and deeply felt.

The sequence of poems from which the volume takes its title uses an airplane flight as the symbol of a voyage of the mind. The airplane symbol is elucidated at various levels of meaning: it appears, naively regarded, as the realization of the Icarus myth and of Leonardo's mathematical fantasies; its place in the pattern of the individual lives which it has created, the lives of the designer and the pilot, is explored; it becomes an expression of the centrifugal impulse of post-Renaissance man; for the average contemporary it is a vehicle of escape and the giver of illusive mastery. The flight is interrupted to focus on details of the scene over which the ship is flying: we are shown the committee room, the idle mine, the lynchings, the squalid streets of the chaotic world over which soars this miracle of coordination. The contrast between mechanical order and human disarray is driven home by the depiction of an air raid on New York—"Icarus' passion, Da Vinci's skill, corrupt, all rotted into war"—and the poet lands on an earth that is to be refashioned.

Miss Rukeyser's poems are among the few so far written in behalf of the revolutionary cause which combine craftsmanship, restraint, and intellectual honesty. She does not boast of proletarian calluses which, having been to Vassar, she does not possess; nor is she one of those poets who learn about the social scene from tabloids in a Greenwich Village basement. Her sketches of the mines and of strikes indicate that she has seen some of them at first hand, and the foreword states that she attended the Roosevelt School of the Air in order to gather material for her aeronautical passages. The use she has made of her experiences is well described by S. V. Benét's remark that she speaks her politics "like a poet, not like a slightly worn phonograph record."

This volume suggests that Miss Rukeyser writes with facility, and that she has so many things to say that she does not always express them with the care that they deserve. While many of the metaphors are, to use her own phrase, "chromium clear," others are blurred with thought that has not been reduced to sensuous terms. Her rhythms often limp; and the poems lack formal unity. One hopes for more strophes as perfectly realized as these:

> The latchpieces of consciousness unfasten.
> We are stroked out of dream and night and myth,
> and turning slowly to awareness, listen
> to the soft bronchial whisperings of death.
>
> Never forget in legendary darkness
> the ways of the hands' turning and the mouth's ways,
> wander in the fields of change and not remember
> a voice and many voices and the evening's burning.

These lines convey thought; they are also "pure poetry," about as pure and as poetical as any lines that are being written today.

PHILIP BLAIR RICE

Order Versus Chaos

Economic Planning. By G. D. H. Cole. Alfred A. Knopf. $3.

FROM Mr. Cole's standpoint it is perhaps unfortunate that his discussion of economic planning should have come out after the frenzy of interest in the subject has somewhat subsided. But planning as a fad and planning as a solution of our present-day economic dilemma have very little in common. A year or two ago the average business man was intrigued by the idea of a plan because it seemed to offer the only possibility of restoring profits. The type of planning which he envisioned, however, almost invariably involved price con-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

trol and limitation of production. Business enterprises welcomed such restrictions in the depth of the depression, but with the return of better conditions they have tended once more to become intolerant of restraint of any kind.

Theoretically, a planned economy could be initiated either by a government seeking to make capitalism work more smoothly or by a socialist state seeking to satisfy the fundamental needs of its population. Certainly some degree of conscious control over economic forces is becoming increasingly necessary, irrespective of the political party in power. But Mr. Cole is convinced that genuine planning is impossible under capitalism as long as parliamentary government exists. Any attempt by such a government to organize capitalist industry for use and not for profit would strike at the very fundamentals of the system. On the other hand, business interests fear to allow the government to set up a mechanism for controlling the economic system in the interest of profits lest demagogues utilize its existence to urge the capture of the machinery of state on a "planning for use" platform. The most that can be expected, then, under capitalism is the rationalization of particular industries with no coordination from above. Yet without such coordination it will be impossible to escape the restrictive tendencies which have hitherto been characteristic of all attempts to introduce foresight and control into the profit system. Under fascism the political obstacles to planning are removed, but the tendency to restrictive and anti-social control remains.

Socialism, on the contrary, necessitates some form of centralized coordination. A socialist government might be committed, as is the British Labor Party, to a program of gradualism and reform. But before many years had passed, and Mr. Cole believes the period would be much shorter than is commonly realized, such a government would find itself forced either to drop the reform program in order to maintain "prosperity" or to speed up its socialistic policies in order to wrest control from the profit-makers. If it took the latter course it would find that it was necessary to adopt a comprehensive plan in order to keep the economic machine in operation.

Owing to the limitations of space it is impossible to examine in any detail the machinery which the author would set up for the control of planning in a technically advanced country such as the United States. The basic principles, however, are worthy of consideration. The first objective of planning, as contrasted with laissez faire, is the utilization of all the resources of society. No indictment of our present planlessness is more telling than the vast discrepancy which exists between our productive possibilities and our actual output. But it is also important that our production be used to the best possible purpose, that it be distributed in such a manner as to stimulate further economic activity and yield the maximum amount of utility to the entire population. Mr. Cole believes that this can best be achieved by distributing to all members of the community a social dividend, and supplementing this by smaller payments to all the working members of the community on a scale sufficient to afford such incentives as may be needed to obtain efficient work. In the United States, for example, he points out that it would be possible to issue a universal social dividend of $10 a week for adults, $6 for persons between sixteen and twenty years of age, and $3 for those under sixteen, and still leave—on the basis of the 1929 income—approximately $36,000,000,000 for all other payments. Although most critics will doubtless dismiss this proposal as utopian and impractical, it is wholly in line with the drift of present-day popular demand. The Alberta Social Creditites, the Townsendites, and the millions of individuals demanding social insurance are all groping in this direction. And why not? It would guarantee that every individual would receive the necessities of life, and would automatically result in the diversion of production into useful channels. Yet it would allow a sufficient supplementary income for efficient workers to provide ordinary comforts and minor luxuries.

The author does not ignore the obstacles which prevent the attainment of his planned society. But he points out that at bottom the difficulties are political rather than economic. And he holds out hope that the progressive decay of capitalism will cause men to demand an ordered economy. If an understanding of the basic problems discussed in this book were more widespread, there might be some justification for this hope.

MAXWELL S. STEWART

Gustav Stresemann

Gustav Stresemann: His Diaries, Letters, and Papers. Edited and Translated by Eric Sutton. The Macmillan Company. Volume I. $5.

GUSTAV STRESEMANN (1878-1929) was one of that group of German statesmen who went into the World War as chauvinistic nationalists and came out sobered and wiser for that harrowing experience. When he was made Reich Chancellor in August, 1923, it was as the acknowledged representative of the heavy industries. Three months later he was retired to make room for the Centrist Dr. Marx, and for the next five years he functioned as Foreign Minister in the Cabinets of Marx and Luther, where he often showed greater sanity and more social understanding than any of his colleagues.

Stresemann left no memoirs. This volume—the second and third are to follow in due course—shows the man as he is reflected in speeches, articles, letters, and occasional notes and records. The collection presents nothing new or sensational—no revelations or diplomatic secrets. It does throw a bright light on one of the most important periods of the Weimar epoch, and for that reason is vital to the student of political developments in post-war Germany.

As a personality Gustav Stresemann was neither unique nor outstanding. He was typical of the stratum to which he belonged. Like Bassermann, whom he succeeded as leader of the National Liberal Party, he occasionally indulged in liberal adventures but always returned to the more conservative nationalist fold. In theory he favored greater influence for the Reichstag, though essentially he sympathized with the monarchist militarism and the imperialism of the ruling class. Such ideals as he had were vague and unformed and never hotly defended—a constitutional empire symbolizing the oneness of the ruler and his people. "Stresemann," says Eric Sutton in his preface, "had always held a constitutional monarchy to be the type of government best suited to the German people. . . . For the Crown Prince he had a positively sentimental regard. . . . Lord d'Abernon records that in Stresemann's opinion the Crown Prince's partiality for horses and women was hardly blameworthy in a prince. It was by Stresemann's instrumentality that the Cabinet was induced to agree to the Crown Prince's return to Germany, in the teeth of the most violent opposition abroad."

Up to the day when he became Chancellor, Stresemann ran true to form. He supported the war. He backed up Ludendorff's *Durchhalten* policy. He voted against the Weimar constitution. He was against the signing of the peace treaty and he condemned Rathenau's *Erfüllungspolitik*. He condoned the fight in the Ruhr and the sabotage policies of the inefficient Cuno, but unlike his colleagues he was too rational to fight lost causes, and when he became Chancellor he put an end to this hopeless struggle. He lacked the vision, however, that finds new paths. He was satisfied to muddle

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

along with a coalition of conservatives and middle parties—*die Grosse Koalition;* indeed, he saw in it the realization of his old dream of a harmonious German people. When the Socialists and Communists united in Saxony and Thuringia to establish a coalition labor government in 1923, it seemed to Stresemann the most natural thing in the world to order out the Reichswehr against these "rebels." For clerical-conservative separatism in Bavaria, a movement really dangerous to the existence of the republic, he showed a sympathetic tolerance.

He completely failed to understand the implications of the international situation in the first period of his governmental activity. Lord Curzon he called an embittered Francophobe whose activities would culminate in a Franco-British war. He asked Count Brockdorff Rantzau, German Ambassador in Moscow, to act with greater dignity in his intercourse with the Bolshevist leaders. "I hope," he wrote, "that you will never be anything but the German count to these Soviet people."

But when Ramsay MacDonald became Prime Minister in Great Britain and Edouard Herriot was made Premier of France, Stresemann, now Foreign Minister of Germany, began to see the world in a new light. Unable to speak any language but German, he had gone to London to attend the negotiations which led to the adoption of the Dawes plan with the feeling that he was entering the enemy's camp. To his amazement he found his adversaries friendly and eager to negotiate. When Herriot finally opened the way for an understanding, the old *Korps* student perforce had to admit that there were honest men on the other side of the Rhine and that more might be accomplished by mutual good-will than by threats and gunfire. The effect of this realization on Stresemann's foreign policy was marked. It lost its narrow Prussian provincialism and earned for Stresemann a reputation which extended far beyond Germany's own national borders and beyond his own time.

The first volume of Stresemann's "Diaries, Letters, and Papers" takes the reader up to the Dawes conference and deals only with the beginnings of Germany's relationship to the League of Nations. In 1924 Germany's part in international affairs was still uncertain. Rathenau's policy of rapprochement with England and France was as yet untried, and Stresemann himself was skeptical and unconverted. The reader will look in vain in this volume for the greatness with which contemporary history has surrounded his name. Stresemann was not a great man. He had no political theory, no vision of the future. His fame must rest on the fact that he had what Germany needed in that painful period of capitalist recovery—the intelligence and good sense to learn from experience and the courage to steer his course in accordance with facts as he found them.

LUDWIG LORE

The Romantic Personality

The Romantic Rebels. By Frances Winwar. Little, Brown and Company. $3.50.

Byron: The Years of Fame. By Peter Quennell. Viking Press. $3.50.

WITH many readers the reputation of the romantic poets—except Wordsworth and the later Byron—is now at its nadir. Yet Miss Winwar, in her joint biography of Keats, Shelley, and Byron, stands pat on all the old evaluations, seldom venturing from the torrent of personal history into such criticism, literary or social, as might have justified that torrent. Keats is "one of the *first* poets of the world," and Shelley is presumably not far behind. Her sympathies are mainly with these two, and like many another of their partisans she heaps much irony on Byron and Wordsworth for failing to understand their worth. Wordsworth figures only as "background," like Napoleon and the Prince Regent, and he is treated as a dry and dour reactionary who makes "arid" criticisms of Keats, presumably from selfish motives. That his disapproval might have been founded on better reasons Miss Winwar does not bother to consider. Nor does she go very deeply into the motives for Byron's coolness toward Keats and Shelley. Indeed, Byron's humanity is played up as gross to serve as a foil to their purity.

A book on the lives of a group of poets whose lives seldom crossed would seem to offer as its sole hope for unity a study of the finer shades in their reactions to one another and to their age. But of course such analysis is harder to do than pure narrative. And it is less exciting to dwell on the subtler aspects of contemporaneity than it is to report the coincidence of one writer's passing another in the night. So under Miss Winwar's rather raw, if vigorous, treatment, those elopements, betrayals, broken hearts, suicides, and dead babies emerge in a grisly caricature.

Mr. Quennell, on the other hand, limits himself to but one poet and but five years of his life—the years of Byron's residence in London, so fertile in love affairs, fame, and disgrace and so unproductive of good poetry. Admitting that that poetry had value only to its age, Mr. Quennell considers two aspects of Byron which are lively issues in any age—his personality, and his importance as a force in the disrupting of old traditions and the forming of new ones. The scene, the contradictions in Byron's character, the people in his life are all described with a finesse and justice rare enough in Byron's biographers. And the discussions of romanticism give the book a meaning which I do not find in Miss Winwar's literal narrative. But good as Mr. Quennell's study is, readable, sensitive, it is not a work of very high vitality, and there is no doubt of its being colored throughout by Mr. Quennell's theory, here and there insinuated, that Byron was homosexual, the divisions in his nature springing from this basic ambiguity. This highly unconventional notion is not impossible but is still far from proved.

FREDERICK DUPEE

Shorter Notices

War. No Profit, No Glory, No Need. By Norman Thomas. Frederick A. Stokes Company. $1.50.

Surely there is no lack of anti-war books. Like an avalanche the indictment of war has been growing. First there were the horror and futility novels and poems, then came the picture books and cartoon collections, and then there were pamphlets on the cost of war, the causes of war, the character of the next war, and the cure of war. Mr. Thomas's book is an epitome of much of this literature approached from a Socialist point of view. The real enemy of peace to him is capitalist nationalism, and until that has been eliminated there is little hope for peace. Meanwhile the general strike and the Oxford oath are useful peace weapons, and disarmament, embargoes, wiping out the R. O. T. C., the ending of imperialism and of the Japanese exclusion act, and international cooperation with all that makes for peace are desirable goals for peace workers. All this is to the good, but there ought to be more. The indictment of war has been so successful that the Mussolinis and Banses are looked upon as madmen. The time has come for another type of literature—on the strategy of peace. This would end the pitiful floundering of the peace movement while military expenditures rise to the empyrean, while war threatens, and while war is actually in process. It would indicate the different approaches to peace according to political faiths and pave the way for the united front in peace action. Much of this is a job in organization,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

but there is a crying need of critical analysis and constructive planning on paper before the anti-war movement is made a vital national power through a realistic strategy. Perhaps Mr. Thomas will follow through with another pamphlet on this urgent subject.

Fortune. By Robert Raynolds. William Morrow and Company. $2.50.

Out of a good romantic tale that takes in both sides of the railroad tracks in a small Pennsylvania city, the author of the Harper prize novel for 1931 has fashioned a social novel of America from post-war prosperity to the New Deal. Mr. Raynolds draws his class lines with sharp sobriety, but his emotions, not unlike those of his friend Thomas Wolfe, to whom he dedicates "Fortune," move in the verbose idealistic world of a bewildered, democratic middle class. On the left the reader will meet, chiefly, the plodding proletarian Parks family, who come to Two Rivers, Pennsylvania, in the vain hope of bettering their fortune. On the right are the good rich people and the bad rich people. The former consist, first of all, of queenly Margaret Preston, née Douglas (cement, railroad equipment), princely Ted Robinson (cautious investments), and delicate Mary Larkin, on whom the author forgot to bestow hemophilia. The evil right forces include the McAvoy brothers, Ned and Lou, who invest in speakeasies and brothels, and Harry Preston, Margaret's somewhat oafish husband, who comes from a family that had run a shoestore back in Michigan and whose wild speculations just before the 1929 crash lead him to ruin and disaster. Out of the turmoil of our present-day social and economic chaos, young Ralph Parks of the proletarian Parkses finally emerges with a little boy begot of the tragic, blue-blooded Mary Larkin. Ralph is still flat broke and jobless, and his aging mother and young sister are laundresses and scrubwomen in Margaret's and Ted's home. But why worry about that? For is he not filled with the desire to "nurture his high thoughts and bid them soar"?

The Fortunes of the Pasquiers. By Georges Duhamel. Translated by Samuel Putnam. Harper and Brothers. $2.50.

The Frenchman's logic landlocks his sentiment in little isolated pools of feeling, disturbing at times to the foreigner but making, to his point of view, the only fitting psychological landscape in which to live. So in this book the Pasquier family receives its identity through the close inspection visited upon it by its most loving member, Laurent, the youngest son. Mother's gentle self-sacrifice, Father's braggadocio and philandering, Cécile's bold genius are adored, despised, worshiped as they affect the well-being of the family unit. An adolescent devotion, shame, and pride make bitter struggle with idealism; the love is encircled by the thought. The family is set off as a link with the past; the present and the future are apart; even Mother, still lovable, settles into place among the lesser saints. Laurent's *éducation sentimentale,* as like the American variety as "Our Gang" is to "La Maternelle," contains within its rich concentration its own reward. One of a series, the book resolves one problem fully. The story, told with acute perception, tender care, and clear, bright humor, will interest and satisfy anyone who reads.

Rebirth: A Book of Modern Jewish Thought. Selected and Edited by Ludwig Lewisohn. Harper and Brothers. $3.50.

The importance of this book does not derive from the messianic zeal of the editor or from the prominence of the twenty-five contributors, but from the aggravated immediacy of the problem to which it is dedicated. This problem is the present plight of the Jews. There is no denying that the drive

SAFEGUARD PRODUCTIVE CAPITAL

Dangerous pressure is exerted on productive capital by growing tax burdens and recurrently inflating ground rents. Capital now stalled in banks would move into productive industry and employ more labor if taxation were transferred from agriculture, manufacture, trade, and real estate improvements and placed on ground values, improved and vacant.

Other programs aim to attack, regiment, or abolish capitalism on the illogical assumption that private ownership of "the tools and machinery of production" is oppressive to labor.

This book, by LOUIS WALLIS, is non-Georgean and non-utopian. It views Marxism as impracticable, and regards the New Deal as only a stop-gap.

Minneapolis Tribune: "A sensible suggestion at a time when big business and small business as well is crying for relief from heavy taxation. . . . Seems to fit the picture of what industry needs today."

All bookstores, 75 cents

Published by DOUBLEDAY, DORAN, *Garden City, N.Y.*

Can Mussolini "hog-tie" Anthony Eden?
READ
SAWDUST CAESAR
By George Seldes

"It is the best, most comprehensive work on Fascist Italy which thus far has been published in the English language. It is to be hoped that it will be widely read and meditated upon. It is doubly useful in that it gives at the same time the account of the facts and the account of the lies."—GAETANO SALVEMINI, in *The Nation.* **$3. HARPERS**

Soviet News STRAIGHT from the Source!
Subscribe to
SOVIET PERIODICALS
in Russian, English, French, German, and other languages.
Sole importers from U. S. S. R. of new books, rare books, dictionaries, grammars, maps, art publications, reproductions, etc.
Catalogs and information furnished on request.
BOOKNIGA CORP.
Dept. N29 255 Fifth Ave. New York City

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

toward emancipation initiated by Moses Mendelssohn has, after a century and a half of diligent pursuit, ended in the Nürnberg decrees. Anti-Semitism is now relatively more rampant and more ubiquitous than at any other time in Jewish history. Even the doors of baptism and assimilation, formerly leading to official sanctuaries, have been closed with a bang. The individual Jew may still "pass" here and there; the mass must live at the questionable mercy of their Gentile neighbors. What, then, is to become of the fifteen million Jews inhabiting the countries of Europe and America? For Mr. Lewisohn and for the contributors to this book—from Theodor Herzl to Maurice Samuel—there is only one answer: Zionism. For all their divergent views, they are agreed that the Jews must denounce the pitfalls of emancipation, embrace the traditional culture of their fathers, build up a homeland in Palestine, and make of themselves a nation like other nations. Without bringing up the usual objections to Zionism, one cannot help asking what is to become of the large majority of Jews who must perforce remain outside of Palestine? How can these millions be expected to emulate their fathers in displaying the yellow badge? And what of those who prefer the teachings of Marx to those of Herzl? "Rebirth" states the dire Jewish problem with passionate perspicacity; only Zionists, however, will approve of the solution offered.

Drama

The Trappings of Romance

CLEMENCE DANE'S romantic tragedy "Granite," now to be seen at the Vanderbilt Theater, was first produced here nearly a decade ago by a semi-professional company at the American Laboratory Theater. Nine years of aging have not improved its quality, and a glance at the files of *The Nation* confirms my impression that I thought about it then what I think about it now. "The scene," I said, "is laid upon a lonely island off the English coast, the characters are a set of strange, wild people, and the action is rather childishly weird and violent."

Miss Dane is a literary dramatist of considerable reputation. She writes like a writer, and some of her more successful plays have always seemed to me rather overpraised for the simple reason that they were so obviously literate when they were not as much more as they were said to be. But in the case of "Granite" there can hardly be two opinions. Despite the fact that it was first published after both "Will Shakespeare" and "A Bill of Divorcement," it seems like prentice work, and might, indeed, have been written by some very bright schoolgirl well versed in romantic literature. There is hardly a situation, a character, or a speech which is not a familiar cliché: the lonely island, the tyrannical husband, the romantic stranger, and the guilty love. Morever, all the trappings are equally familiar: the howling wind, the innocent maidservant with nightgown and candle who sings snatches of folk ballads, and the evil genius cast up mysteriously from the sea. For all I know, the author may have been in the grip of a perfectly genuine emotion. She may have had something to say which had never been said before. But if so, she was the victim of her familiarity with a style which has been exploited so thoroughly that it cannot suggest anything but an echo. Ten years ago the play was staged by Richard Boleslavsky, who superimposed upon it a certain Russian morbidity that was not exactly suitable but constantly teased one with the suspicion that there might just possibly be some meaning in the thing after all. At the Vanderbilt it is acted in a straightforward "Mysteries of Udolpho" fashion which conceals nothing. Between the two methods one may take one's choice, but there is actually not much to choose.

"I Want a Policeman" (Lyceum Theater) is a detective play at least equally routine. I will not pretend that even after all these years I remain wholly unmoved when the fiend with a pistol at the back of the lovely heroine forces her to declare that all is well at the very moment she needs so desperately to call for the help which is near at hand. But not even a detective play need keep quite so close to the formula as this one does, with its beautiful young wife unjustly suspected of the murder of her aging husband, its two detectives—one comic, one romantic—and its blundering amateur who takes everything down in a notebook. I am not a good guesser; accordingly, when I spotted the criminal in the first scene of the second act I concluded that the mystery was not as well concocted as it might have been.

JOSEPH WOOD KRUTCH

Films

René Clair Goes West

THE progress of René Clair from Paris to Hollywood has halted long enough for him to make a picture in London, and this picture, "The Ghost Goes West" (Rivoli), should be remembered by those who will soon be saying that Hollywood has been his ruination. There is of course no telling what Hollywood will do for him; and for my part I have little sympathy with certain European directors whom it is said to have silenced. Hollywood is a citadel to be conquered, and if it conquers instead I find it difficult to believe that the weakness was out there rather than in the victim. At any rate, here is Clair's latest picture; it was made before he reached California; and it is a failure.

It is only relatively a failure. "The Ghost Goes West" is more amusing and more imaginative than the average film of whatever provenance, and indeed the audience of which I was a part laughed loud and long. But that is perhaps the point. It laughed too loud and long, and laughed in the wrong places—provided there is any meaning in the reference one naturally makes to Clair's earlier work, where the finest kind of balance was maintained between the ridiculous and the delicate, between the false and the true, between exaggeration and exquisiteness. "Sous les Toits de Paris" maintained those balances so skilfully that it came as near to perfection as any conceivable film of its kind—and there has actually never been another of its kind, as there has never been a director like Clair at his best. At his best he played upon his audiences with a wonderfully sound and subtle touch, producing upon the human instrument a comic music not unlike that which Shakespeare produced through the older medium of words. But he has lost that touch, and he was losing it even before he left Paris, as "The Last Millionaire" made depressingly plain. Traces of it survive in "The Ghost Goes West"; the picture, as I have said, is better than the average, and for all I know it will be a success in the United States. But the vulgarity which once was Clair's most beautiful asset is now beyond his control, and therefore has lost its beauty. The touch is not positive any more.

The story is of a Scottish ghost, an eighteenth-century Glourie who in the twentieth century haunts the castle of his ancestors hoping that he may undo the disgrace of his cowardice in some old battle. The prologue shows us that battle; the body of the film shows us the castle being sold to an American who will remove it, ghost and all, to Florida in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

RESORTS

The LAKE VIEW
is preferred for excellent location, splendid modern cuisine and different clientele.
Moderate Rates
59 Madison Avenue, Lakewood, N. J.
ANNA EPSTEIN
Tel. Lakewood 287-963

Rebecca Silver Invites You to
FOREST HOUSE At Interlaken
Miles of Lake, Hills and Dales—America's Switzerland—Excellent Cuisine—All Outdoor Sports—Indoors, conviviality. Rates Moderate. Auto or N. Y. Central—50 miles—Open all year—of course.
LAKE MAHOPAC, N. Y. Mahopac 977, 688

ZINDOREST PARK
Monroe, N. Y. Phone 7755
CLOSED NOW
WILL RE-OPEN
MARCH 20TH

RED OAKS
Atlantic Highlands, N. J.
ANNOUNCEMENT
Red Oaks is taking a vacation. Will be closed to guests from January 6th until February 19th. Will open for the Washington's Birthday week end. Make reservations now by either mail or telephone.
Atlantic Highlands, 264.

Hillcrest Lodge among the Watchung Mts. 25 minutes by train, 50 by car. Golf, tennis, handball; riding nearby. Plainfield, N. J. Millington 364. City address, 114 Fenimore St., Brooklyn, 3E.

"THE DELIGHTFUL HIDEAWAY in the mountains" has been closed for alterations since January 1st. Will reopen February 20th.
CHESTERS' ZUNBARG
Woodbourne, N. Y. Fallsburg 2 F 22

A Cozy Retreat in the Pines
MILLARD'S
Offers Choice Accommodations, Delicious Meals. "Dietary Laws." Moderate Rates.
801 CLIFTON AVE. LAKEWOOD, N. J.
Phone: Lakewood 216-W

BLUE MOUNTAIN LODGE
will reopen
FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1936
for the Washington's Birthday Weekend
Make reservations now. *Write or phone*
Peekskill, N. Y. Phone 1403

APARTMENT TO SHARE

DESIRE third person of intellect, age about 25, to share comfortable bachelor apartment in superior Brooklyn neighborhood. Total contribution $20. monthly. Box 697, % The Nation.

ORANGES FOR SALE

SWEET, juicy, sun-ripened on trees. Delivered Express prepaid. $3.50 bushel. Grapefruit $3.50. No sprays used. A. H. Burket, Sebring, Florida.

LANGUAGES

23 LANGUAGES
SPEAK ANY MODERN LANGUAGE IN 3 MONTHS BY LINGUAPHONE
UNIQUE METHOD BRINGS VOICES OF NATIVE MASTERS INTO YOUR OWN HOME..SEND FOR FREE BOOK
LINGUAPHONE INSTITUTE
81 Rockefeller Center · New York

FINANCIAL

U. S. S. R.
7% GOLD BONDS, 1943
At Market—To Yield about 6%
State Bank of U. S. S. R. repurchases bonds at par, on demand.
Soviet American Securities Corp.
30 Broad St., N. Y. HAnover 2-5330

ART MART

ORIGINALS
Oils—Water Colors—Graphics
Framed and Unframed
Large Selection of Etchings at $5.00
THE ART MART
505 Eighth Ave., at 35th Street, N. Y.
Mezzanine Floor
Sachs Quality Furniture, Inc.

PIANO WANTED

WILL store baby grand or good upright piano in return for use. Excellent care. Write Box 691, % The Nation.

DO YOU WANT
A POSITION?
SOMEONE FOR A POSITION?
for the response of employers and intelligent applicants for employment, read THE NATION.
Rates: .62 a line of 6 words
Minimum 3 lines
THE NATION
20 Vesey Street New York City
Tel. COrtlandt 7-3330

LECTURES

COOPER UNION
Department of Social Philosophy
(Formerly The People's Institute)
IN THE GREAT HALL
8th Street and Astor Place—at 8 o'clock
Admission Free

Friday, January 31st
EVERETT DEAN MARTIN
Thesis 9: "From the Psychological Point of View Communism, Fascism, and Nazism are More Alike Than Different."
Sunday, February 2nd
NATHANIEL PEFFER
"What Do We Mean by Decadence of Culture?"
Tuesday, February 4th
PROF. EDWARD G. SPAULDING
"The Philosopher and the Struggle for Freedom."

TRAVEL

The Compass Travel Bureau
Takes pleasure in announcing a
Summer Travel Seminar
to the
SOVIET UNION
under the leadership of
Dr. MARK GRAUBARD, *Geneticist*
Author of "Genetics and the Social Order"
•
Sailing in the beginning of July; returning the first days of September
•
For full information and descriptive pamphlet write or call
COMPASS TRAVEL BUREAU
55 West 42nd St., New York City
LOngacre 5-3070

SYMPOSIUM

FORUM EXTRAORDINARY
and Banquet of *Common Sense*
Gen. Smedley D. Butler, A. F. Whitney, Roger Baldwin, Carleton Beals, Stuart Chase, John Chamberlain, Archibald MacLeish, Benjamin Stolberg and others WILL DISCUSS: *What I Would Do If I Were President.*
Seats: $1.50, *Tables of 8:* $12. *Reserve Now!*
Common Sense, 315 4th Ave., N. Y. ST. 9-0516

HELP WANTED

NEWLY established Cooperative publication in the metropolitan area needs an energetic organizer to complete a share-selling campaign that has already netted $20,000 under volunteer direction. The right man has social vision, knowledge of the labor or cooperative movement (preferably contacts also), and some ability as a straightforward speaker. He must know how to overcome many handicaps through merited confidence in the project. Salary and commissions to fit the man; permanent position possible for one who is familiar with publishing. Write frankly. Box 698, % The Nation.

PROFESSIONAL SERVICES

J. G. EDMONDS, LITERARY AGENT
Marketing on commission. No advance charged.
5639 Rippey St., Pittsburgh, Pa.
(or 108 W. 85th St., N. Y.)

When writing to advertisers please mention The Nation

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

☐ THEATERS ☐ MEETING ☐

"I was greatly impressed by 'PARADISE LOST', so much so that I have been thinking of it ever since. It is crowded with illuminating material. It should cause millions to think and even if it did not do that it should still be recommended as thrilling entertainment."
—*Theodore Dreiser*

'Paradise Lost'

By Clifford Odets

LONGACRE THEA. W. 48th St. Eves. 8:40. Mats. Wed. & Sat. 2:40

Honor the Martyred Heroes of Nazi Germany!

Let your voice be heard by the League of Nations in support of the proposals made by

THE HONORABLE JAMES G. McDONALD

AT

A MEMORIAL MEETING

to the

2,000 Killed
100,000 in Concentration Camps
Sacrificed in the struggle for Freedom, Peace and Justice

ST. NICHOLAS PALACE

66TH STREET AND COLUMBUS AVENUE

WED. JAN. 29th, 1936 8:00 P. M.

Chairman: CLARK M. EICHELBERGER
Executive Secretary of the League of Nations Association

Speakers: OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD
DR. HENRY SMITH LEIPER
GEN. SMEDLEY D. BUTLER
DR. ISRAEL GOLDSTEIN
JONATHAN EDDY

Tickets 25c. (Reserved sections for tickets purchased in advance)
WORKERS BOOKSHOP—50 East 13th Street

AUSPICES: ANTI-NAZI FEDERATION
168 West 23rd Street CH. 2-3759

☐ JOSEPH WOOD KRUTCH says ☐

Boy Meets Girl. Cort Theater. Rough and ready satire on Hollywood, but probably the funniest thing of its kind since "Once in a Lifetime."

Dead End. Belasco Theater. A play about gangsters in the making on an East River waterfront. Superbly acted by a group of boys. More a good show than a great drama, but a very good show indeed.

Jumbo. Hippodrome. Paul Whiteman, Jimmy Durante, and a remarkable clown named A. Robbins surrounded by acrobats and animals. Literally better than a circus.

Let Freedom Ring. Civic Repertory Theater. A second chance for this drama of a strike in a Southern mill. I found it hard going, but it has been highly praised.

Libel. Henry Miller Theater. Exciting English court-room play. Surprisingly probable for this sort of thing and superbly acted.

Mid-West. Booth Theater. Homely and slightly sentimental picture of the joys and more particularly the sorrows of the farmer. Best when it isn't editorializing.

Paradise Lost. Longacre Theater. Clifford Odets' complicated picture of a family composed exclusively of pathological futilitarians. He calls it a picture of the middle class but it strikes me as somewhat less than typical.

Pride and Prejudice. Plymouth Theater. Amazingly successful adaption, brilliantly staged and acted. It gave me more pleasure than any other play of the season.

Victoria Regina. Broadhurst Theater. Delightful series of scenes from Laurence Housman's drama stunningly acted by Helen Hayes and others. Fairer to the matron queen than Strachey but funny nevertheless and charming besides.

Winterset. Martin Beck Theater. Maxwell Anderson's surprisingly successful attempt to write a poetic play on a modern theme. Bold, original, and engrossing.

order that the current Glourie may pay his debts; and the conclusion shows us how on a foreign strand the disgrace is suddenly blotted out—and how the current Glourie marries the millionaire's daughter among drawbridges and limousines, among portcullises and palm trees, while a radio plays in every room of the castle and floodlights sweep the sky above Miami. This is very well. The story is obviously a rich one for Clair's purposes, since it provides him ample opportunity for that careful prance along the wall between sentiment and satire which he has always delighted to take as his artist's risk. But he constantly slips. The battle is neither funny nor heroic, and if it tries to be both at the same time, as it probably does, it fails, becoming as it proceeds a rather embarrassing mess. The chorus of creditors in the castle is feeble and artificial. And the Florida business is handled with a barren vulgarity of which Hollywood comedy has rarely achieved the match. I am not referring, of course, to the vulgarity which Clair satirizes; I am referring to the vulgarity of his satire, which is mechanical and desperately uninspired. There is no lack of nice things here and there along the way, and there is always the reminder that this man once held a precious secret in his hands. But he has lost it, and I cannot believe that anything outside of himself is to blame. As to Hollywood being his ultimate destination, I should explain that there is merely a current rumor to this effect.

The best foreign films I saw during the fortnight were two German ones at the Bijou Theater, "The Making of a King" and "The Private Life of Louis XIV." The first was distinguished by the superb acting of Emil Jannings as Friedrich Wilhelm I of Prussia, represented here in a very difficult and dramatic relationship to his son, who is to be Frederick the Great. The second made interesting capital out of a German princess's life at Versailles, the contrast between luxurious France and plain-dealing Hanover supplying the materials for a superior costume piece. "A Man's Children" (Cinéma de Paris), a Swedish comedy based on Edward Childs Carpenter's play "The Bachelor Father," was apparently uproarious to those who could understand the dialogue. Even without that advantage I found it so spirited and delightful that I went a second time.

MARK VAN DOREN

Contributors to This Issue

LOUIS FISCHER, *The Nation's* Moscow correspondent, is the author of "Soviet Journey" and other books on Russia. At present he is traveling in Western Europe observing the political scene.

WALTER MILLIS is the author of "The Road to War" and "The Martial Spirit."

PAUL W. WARD, a regular Washington correspondent of the Baltimore *Sun,* is contributing a weekly letter to *The Nation* on developments in the capital.

RAY L. KRINGER is state editor of the Decatur *Herald-Review.*

RUTH BRINDZE is chairman of the Westchester County Consumers' Council and the author of "How to Spend Money."

PHILIP BLAIR RICE contributes reviews and critical articles to various periodicals.

LUDWIG LORE was formerly editor of the New York *Volkszeitung.* He now conducts a column, "Behind the Cables," in the New York *Post.*

FREDERICK DUPEE, formerly an editor of the *Miscellany* and a contributor to the *Symposium* and the *Bookman,* has spent the last two years in Mexico. He is now at work on a book of sketches of Mexican life.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED